

# THE CLERGY REVIEW

## LEO XIII AS SOCIOLOGIST

BY THE REV. LEWIS WATT, S.J., B.Sc.(Econ.).

IT is said that during an interview between Pope Leo XIII and the Kaiser Wilhelm II, the Pope being seated on his throne and the Emperor standing close beside him, Wilhelm trembled so violently that his silver helmet fell from his arm and rolled clatteringly down the steps of the papal throne to the ground. Whether the story be true or not, it is certainly *ben trovato*, for all who came into contact with Leo agree that when he was exercising his supreme office he was almost terrifyingly majestic, though in private conversations he was approachable and familiar. It is curious then to remember that when he was nuncio in Belgium the Government tried to have him recalled to Rome on the ground that he was timid, irresolute, and inexperienced in dealing with men and affairs. Possibly his character developed unexpected strength during the thirty years which elapsed between his departure from Belgium and his election as Pope; certainly those thirty years, spent in the active administration of a large diocese, must have enlarged his experience of men and affairs. But it is very probable that the opinion which the Belgian Government professed to hold of his abilities was much influenced by his refusal to aid and abet it in its contests with the Belgian episcopate.

The future Leo XIII, Joachim Pecci, was sent as nuncio to Belgium when he was thirty-three years old, in 1843, by Gregory XVI, but it was not his first experience of ecclesiastical politics. He had already spent three years as Apostolic Delegate to Benevento, and another two years as Delegate to Perugia. At Benevento the political situation was delicate, and he must have found his position anything but a bed of roses. Benevento was under papal sovereignty, but it formed an enclave within the Kingdom of Naples. Not only

the Neapolitan Government but the citizens of Benevento desired the cession of the territory to Naples, for political and economic reasons. To this Gregory XVI refused to agree, and it is easy to understand that his representative would scarcely be popular. There was, moreover, long-standing friction between the Archbishop of Benevento and the Apostolic Delegates. The province was infested with bandits, and many of the population belonged to the Young Italy movement, to say nothing of the Carbonari. It was decidedly no weak man, timid and irresolute, who succeeded, as Pecci did, in stamping out brigandage almost entirely, in effecting a reconciliation with the Archbishop, and in reorganizing the customs and the administrative regulations. He displayed the same firmness and practical ability when he was transferred to Perugia in 1841. He reorganized the Government and the administration of justice, improved the means of communication, and (significant of later developments) encouraged the establishment of Savings Banks in order to protect traders and farmers from the usurers. The population liked him well enough to ask for him as their Bishop when the see fell vacant.

That Rome regarded him as a successful administrator is clear from the fact that he was appointed two years later Archbishop of Dalmatia and sent as nuncio to Belgium. There he found himself inevitably involved in the political questions which were agitating the country, independent of Holland since the Revolution of 1830 but under a non-Catholic King, Leopold I. The Constitution was markedly favourable to the Catholic Church, but Catholics were by no means exercising the influence in the State to which their numbers entitled them. This seems to have been owing to their lack of energy, for Pecci reported to Rome that they were sluggish and almost inactive, whereas their political opponents, the Liberals, were extraordinarily active. The anti-clerical attitude of the Liberals made their political predominance a matter of anxiety to the Episcopate and the Nuncio, and relations between the Government and the representatives of the Church were not free from friction, particularly in the matter of education. When the Belgian Episcopate succeeded in defeating a Government proposal relating to State examinations, the Cabinet felt that the Nuncio was largely responsible, as it also did with regard to the

issue by the Bishops of a pastoral on bad books. As has been mentioned, he was accused of being timid and wanting in authority; in other words, of not influencing the Bishops in the direction desired by the Cabinet.

Pecci must have felt his position keenly, though he showed no trace of pique, when even Cardinal Lambruschini wrote from Rome to reprove him for being too negative. He contented himself with explaining certain difficulties, notably that the clergy, and particularly the very influential Cardinal of Malines, saw no need for an Apostolic Delegate in Belgium, in view of the provisions of the Constitution allowing the Episcopate to have free intercourse with the Vatican. Had he known it, he might have referred to Austrian intrigues against him going on behind his back. In pursuance of his "Josephism," Metternich took steps to discredit a nuncio who, as he realized, was by no means prepared to support the State at the expense of the Church, and he unfortunately found an instrument of his policy towards Pecci in the nuncio to Vienna.

Time was to prove the success of the Belgian nuncio's policy, and very soon Leopold was to refer to him as one of those who best understood the state of affairs in Belgium, but in 1845 the pressure of the Belgian and Austrian Governments decided the authorities in Rome to recall him. This step was delayed till 1846, when he was appointed to the Bishopric of Perugia. His diplomatic career was broken, the powerful Metternich was hostile, the almost equally powerful Cardinal Antonelli far from friendly.

It is further evidence of the integrity and power of character of the future Pope that he threw himself into his new duties without resentment at the intrigues which had displaced him. He was to spend thirty years in his see, and those thirty years were crowded with activity. Eduardo Soderini, who knew Leo XIII intimately, tells us in his study of the Pope<sup>1</sup> that he read all important books, reviews and newspapers; a habit he retained when he became Pope, when

it was really remarkable to see him in his study, where not only was his desk littered with papers and newspapers, but

<sup>1</sup> *The Pontificate of Leo XIII.* Vol. I. Burns Oates & Washbourne. 7s. 6d.

these were often scattered on the floor round, no one being allowed to touch them.

He kept in touch with foreign affairs through many correspondents abroad and through conversations with visiting bishops (almost all who came to Italy made a point of calling on the Bishop of Perugia) and foreign diplomats and public men. The breadth of his interests is shown by his pastorals, an edition of which in English would be of the greatest interest. No less than three dealt with the problem of the relations of the Church to modern progress, which he welcomed on condition that it included moral and religious progress as well as economic and material advance. He did not hesitate to denounce exploitation of the workers, and protested vehemently against the employment of children in factories. On the practical side of social action he organized workmen's clubs, founded institutions for the education of the sons of workmen, extended institutions for agricultural credit, and on one occasion took measures which averted a threatened famine. The Pope of Social Action is already delineated in the Bishop of Perugia. Pope Leo XIII's revival of Thomist philosophy is a matter of common knowledge, and this too was foreshadowed at Perugia, where he set up the Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas for the younger clergy. His interest in higher education was shown by his improvement in the course of studies of the diocesan clergy and by his reorganization of the University of Perugia. Had he had his way, he would have improved political conditions in that papal dependency, but here he was frustrated by Antonelli. While he was prepared to agree with the famous Cardinal that Pius IX had moved too quickly in the direction of Liberalism, he differed from him in believing that the reaction had gone too far.

The result of his work at Perugia was that men formed a much truer idea of him than they had done during the difficult days in Belgium. In a letter quoted by Soderini and written while Pecci was still at Perugia by the Italian revolutionary Rattazzi occur the following significant passages :

On several occasions I spoke of him with King Leopold. We spoke of his great prudence, his incorruptibility and his dignity, which inspires the officials of our Government with an invincible fear of his person. His devotion to the Holy See is unlimited, his principles most vigorous, his



firmness inflexible, almost obstinate; he does not allow even a suspicion of weakness. . . . A man of wide political views and of still greater knowledge.

Either some great change had come over the character of the one-time nuncio who had been reproached for being timid, irresolute, negative; or, more probably, he was seen more clearly and judged more fairly when not standing amidst the dust raised by political passions.

Yet he was now an old man, sixty-eight years old, of feeble health. He had done a great work for Christ at Perugia, and might reasonably look forward to ending his days peacefully in retirement. In point of fact, his greatest work lay all ahead of him. When, at the conclave which followed the death of Pius IX in 1878, he saw himself threatened with the burden of the papacy, he tried to evade it on the ground of age and ill-health. He prophesied that, if he were elected, his reign would be extremely brief, and that soon the Church would be disturbed by another conclave to elect his successor. From this pessimistic view it does not seem to have occurred to others to differ. They wanted him for Pope, even if only for a brief space, and, while reminding him that God might prolong his days, they urged the good he might do even in a short pontificate. He yielded to their urgency, and became Pope on February 20th. He was to reign for twenty-five years, and to leave the papacy in a position of moral pre-eminence to which many had believed it could never again attain. The young nuncio who had admitted to feeble health and who had been accused of feeble character was to live to the age of ninety-three, active to the last, and was to manifest a resolute firmness of purpose, a majestic dignity and a political tact and wisdom which dwarfed his contemporaries. As for his personal austerity of life, his moral excellence, that was never questioned even by his worst enemies.

Only a few months after his election, he published his first encyclical letter, *Inscrutabili*, on the evils affecting modern society. After summing up the spirit of the age as one of intellectual, moral and political disorder, and making a pointed reference to the waste and mismanagement of public funds, he traces the evil to the rejection of the authority of the Church, herself the upholder and defender of all legitimate authority.

On the positive and constructive side, he urges the importance of a sound Christian education, particularly in philosophy, and emphasizes the necessity of a return to Christian ideals of marriage and family life. To these points he was to return later in his pontificate, at greater length.

At the end of the same year, the encyclical, *Quod Apostolici*, which may be called the first of his social encyclicals, attacks Communism, rationalism and naturalism. While vindicating the divine origin of legitimate political authority, he warns rulers and Governments that their position is that of trustees for the good of their subjects. His chief purpose was not to set out a programme for social reform (that was to come in 1891), but to show that States could not resist disruption if they rejected religion, and that civilization required the support of the Catholic Church. He was, in fact, laying the foundations for that restoration of the prestige of the Church which he did so much to effect in the course of his reign.

The contents of this encyclical seem so unexceptionable, at any rate to Catholics, that it is hard for us to realize that in some Catholic circles the doctrine of the Pope created uneasiness, to put it mildly. Incredible as it may seem, there were not wanting those (especially outside Italy) who feared that "the people" would be encouraged to ask too much, and who tried to induce Leo to change his policy. The comment of this man of nearly seventy deserves to be put on record: "These people are too old for me," he said.

From that time onward, we see him building up, in encyclical after encyclical, a Christian sociology, a task for which his long experience of affairs in Italy and abroad, and his close contact with the best thought of his own day as well as with the traditional philosophy of Catholicism, fitted him in an exceptional degree. The fundamental natural society amongst men is evidently the family, for which conjugal society primarily exists. Without the family-group children could still be born and reared, no doubt, but their upbringing would fall far short of what is possible in the bosom of the family. In defending the family and its rights, in defining the respective duties of parents and children, in urging the fulfilment of those duties, the Church is rendering

an inestimable service to the human race and to the progress of mankind. To this task Pope Leo set himself in the encyclical on Christian Marriage, which appeared in 1880. As the title shows, it is mainly to the Sacrament of Marriage that he devotes his attention in this letter. He defends monogamy, and draws attention to the abuses which accompanied the degradation of marriage amongst the pagans, resulting in the loss of woman's dignity and the growth of licentiousness amongst men. The *patria potestas* he stigmatizes as "the monstrous power of life and death." The encyclical is both theological and sociological. From the latter point of view, it is interesting to notice that the Pope expresses himself in very friendly terms about the authority of the State, fully admitting that in its own sphere it is sovereign and independent, and urging it, in the interests of social concord, to come to an agreement with the Church on matters which fall within the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical and the civil authority jointly, though in different ways.

Logically pursuing the development of his teaching, he went more fully into the relations between Church and State in a still more famous encyclical, *Immortale Dei*, on the Christian Constitution of States (1885). The Church's authority comes from God, but so does that of the State (if justly constituted). Since individuals and even families cannot, if they live isolated from one another, secure all that they require for a full human life, it is a precept of Nature that mankind should form civil societies to obtain that full temporal welfare which is otherwise inaccessible to them. But such civil societies would fail of their purpose had they no supreme authority to co-ordinate the common effort, and thus political authority is as natural as civil society. And to say that it is natural, in this context, is to say that it comes from God, the Author of Nature.

This point he had already developed more fully in his letter on Civil Sovereignty, *Diuturnum* (1881), published shortly after the assassination of the Tsar Alexander II, an encyclical which has not, unfortunately, been included in the C.T.S. English edition of Leo's letters (*The Pope and the People*). While rejecting the theory of the State associated with the name of Rousseau, he fully admits that any *form* of Government is legitimate so

long as it is adapted to promote the common welfare of the State.

Returning to *Immortale Dei*, it lays down the principle that the Church and the State are each sovereign in their own sphere. Since these spheres overlap to some extent, the State is not entitled to neglect the rights and jurisdiction of the Church, as, for example, by claiming jurisdiction over the marriages of Catholics (the Pope is not, of course, thinking of the mere requirement of civil registration of Catholic marriages), confiscating ecclesiastical property, and in general treating the Church as a mere sect. To this question of the relations of Church and State Leo was to return more than once. He treats of it again in the encyclical on Human Liberty (1888), and in that on the chief duties of Christians as citizens (1890). But as the problem is dealt with at proper length in the usual text-books of apologetic theology, further discussion of it may be omitted here.

The last mentioned encyclical, that of 1890, dealt with a subject very near to the heart of Leo XIII. In *Immortale Dei* he had insisted that it is a matter of great moment to the public welfare that Catholics should take part in public administration, both local and national, more particularly because abstention would mean that "men whose principles offer but small guarantee for the welfare of the State will the more readily seize the reins of government." No doubt he had not forgotten the impressions which he had received and recorded when nuncio in Belgium. In the encyclical of 1890 (*Sapientiae Christianae*) he discusses the question of patriotism, teaching that we are bound to love our country, and that true patriotism in no way conflicts with our duties to the Church; for while we are to love both countries, that of earth and that of heaven, it is no true patriotism which puts the State above the Church or human laws above the law of God. He urges upon Catholics their duty to defend the faith vigorously and to propagate it to the utmost of their ability. Politically, they must support men of acknowledged worth, who pledge themselves to deserve well in the Catholic cause; and if they mean to take an active part in public life, they must be careful to act according to Catholic principles, neither minimizing those principles nor putting forward as Catholic their own private

opinions. "Honour then to those who shrink not from entering the arena, as often as need calls," he proclaims. A year later he wrote in *Rerum Novarum*: "Those Catholics are worthy of all praise who, understanding what the times require, have striven to better the condition of the working-class by rightful means." So long as the *Non expedit* was maintained, political life was closed to Catholics in Italy, but it is evident that Leo XIII had no desire that such a policy of abstention should be followed in countries where conditions were utterly different.

The mention of *Rerum Novarum* brings us to this, perhaps the best known, encyclical, of which many thousands of copies have been sold in Great Britain, and the demand for which still continues. In earlier letters the Pope had dealt with the very foundations of social life: the family, the State, the Church and religion. He had pressed for a restoration of Thomist philosophy as a bulwark against the destructive influences of the divergent Cartesian and post-Cartesian schools. In *Praestantissimum* he had examined the claims of human liberty, and established their proper place in a true scheme of values. It remained for him to turn his attention to the claims of the workers for greater social justice in the new industrialism of the nineteenth century.

It would be an entire mistake to imagine that Leo XIII had given no heed to the condition of the working-classes until he wrote about it in 1891. As we have seen, he had concerned himself with the question while still at Perugia, nor was he ignorant that Catholics in various countries were more and more occupying themselves with proposals for social reform. In 1885 a Union for social studies was formed in Rome, to which at least four future Cardinals belonged and which included eminent ecclesiastics and laymen of many nationalities: the Dominican Father Denifle, the Swiss leader Decurtins, Mgr. Mermillod, Lorin from France, and others. They studied such living questions as international labour conditions, wage-problems, the right of private property, the labour of women and children, interest and usury, and their discussions were reported from time to time to the Pope. But far more important than this Roman Union was another which owed its existence to the Marquis de la Tour du Pin, and which became known



as the Fribourg Union. It consisted of representatives of Catholic social study-groups in different countries who met, to the number of about a score, at Fribourg for the purpose of discussing social problems, and above all of framing international labour legislation. The first meeting was held in 1885. Mgr. Mermillod was the chairman, through whom the resolutions of the Union were periodically communicated to the Pope.

The Fribourg Union could count on an informed and active membership, for the Catholic Social Movement was already well developed. Ketteler had set the pace in Germany, the Comte de Mun was hard at work in France, Decurtins was one of the most influential and popular men in Switzerland, in Belgium the Abbé Pottier founded the Belgian Democratic League and Helleputte the *Boerenbond* (Peasants' Union) which was to meet with such remarkable success even to our own day. In other countries too Catholics were showing that they were awake to the problems of growing industrialism. There was Manning in England, Lueger and others in Austria, Gibbons in the United States of America. In Spain a Social Congress at Saragossa in 1890 set up a permanent committee for social study. In Italy fourteen Catholic Congresses were held between 1878 and 1903.

Further factors in the preparation of conditions suitable for the issue of *Rerum Novarum* were the pilgrimages of workmen and employers to Rome, protesting their devotion to the Pope and appealing to him to raise his voice on the social questions of the day, and the affair of the American Knights of Labour, the story of which has so often been told but which is too long for repetition in this article. Nor must one forget the Berlin Conference of 1890, which originated with Decurtins but was taken up by the Kaiser Wilhelm II. Its purpose was to secure international legislation for the protection of the workers. The Pope approved strongly, though he deemed it wise to decline to send an official representative. The Prince-Bishop of Breslau, however, attended as representative of the Kaiser. On the other hand, Leo XIII willingly consented to send an official representative to the sessions of the International Association for the Legal Protection of the Workers, which was founded in Switzerland.

The time was clearly ripe for an official pronouncement

on the Church's attitude to the claims of the workers, and on May 15th, 1891, Leo published *Rerum Novarum*.

A short digression may be permitted on the method employed by the Pope in preparing his encyclicals. Soderini tells us that he did not like writing. Having fixed the main outline of the subject to be dealt with and its development, he used to entrust the collection of material to others. A rough draft was submitted to him for consideration. When it had received his final approval, it had to be drawn up in a more precise and elegant form by one of his secretaries or some prelate. This he again revised before publication. The first draft of *Rerum Novarum* was drawn up by Cardinal Zigliara, but the Pope considered it "too prolix and perhaps too theoretical" (Soderini). He therefore had it re-moulded by his secretaries, before sending it back to Zigliara for comment. The Cardinal contented himself with a few minor alterations, and finally the Pope gave it some final touches before issuing it. The contents of the encyclical must by this time be so familiar to the clergy that it is unnecessary to summarize it. Perhaps its most important section, in view of the needs of our own time, is that which deals with associations and the right to form them, repeating earlier messages of Leo about the desirability of a renovation of the old gild system.

The interest aroused by *Rerum Novarum* may be measured by the controversies which soon arose as to the exact sense of certain passages in it, controversies to which Pius XI alludes in *Quadragesimo Anno*. The most ardent was that which centred round the question of the living wage; does strict justice demand an individual wage or a family wage? This was the only point on which the Pope yielded to requests that he should settle the controversies by his own authority, and the result was not happy. The question was referred to Zigliara, and his reply has only served to widen the dispute. For this Soderini seems to blame Zigliara, but it is only fair to say that the question was proposed to him in an unsatisfactory form. Some have been surprised at the Pope's refusal to intervene in these controversies, but Soderini tells us that Leo declared: "God has left the solution of many questions to the free judgment of men. Why ever should the Church, even before such discussions have taken place, prevent them by imposing silence on all?"

The last of the great Leonine social encyclicals appeared in 1901, *Graves de Communi*, on Christian democracy. Although the Pope had made it clear (particularly in *Praeantissimum*) that the Church is in no way opposed to a democratic form of government, yet the phrase Christian Democracy was an object of suspicion, even to some Catholics. It had been used for the first time at the Belgian Catholic Workers' Congress of 1893, and subsequently adopted by the eminent sociologist Toniolo. Critics professed to see in it a revival of the revolutionary spirit; for them democracy suggested Rousseau and mob-rule. On the other hand, it commanded enthusiasm amongst great numbers whose Catholicism was in no way suspect. There was, in fact, all the material for one of those fruitless controversies which divide men of good will and prevent effective Catholic action. Nothing could avert this but the intervention of authority, as Leo clearly saw. He submitted the question to a committee of five Cardinals, and, having heard their report, issued his decision. He sanctioned the term Christian Democracy, on condition that it was not understood in a political sense. It must mean Christian action for the spiritual and material welfare of the masses of the people; not a movement for some democratic form of government in preference to any other form admitted by the Church to be legitimate. It is in this sense that it has been adopted by the Catholic Social Guild for its monthly journal, *The Christian Democrat*.

Inadequate as this survey of the social encyclicals of Leo has been, it must surely have demonstrated that amongst his titles to fame and to the lasting gratitude of the Church not the least important is that of having laid, firmly and truly, the foundations of an official Catholic sociology. On those foundations his successors have built, are building and will continue to build, as circumstances require; and the edifice of Catholic social philosophy will be secure because its foundations are unshakeable.

## HUMAN UNITY

BY THE REV. CONRAD PEPLER, O.P.

**I**T is a fact that modern civilization is being shaken to its foundation by disunion and discord. No doubt it is Adam's fault, and has ever been a characteristic feature of man's relation with his neighbour. The lack of unity among men, however, stands out with unprecedented distinctness to-day, because this cracking civilization is of such enormous proportions. The small Athenian State could have its revolution over the week-end and be ready to take down the shutters to start business as usual on Monday morning; now the crisis involves the whole of the westernized world.

The general view shows complete disruption, a conflict which makes us apprehensive of the morrow. The absence of actual warfare proves no peace when the very colour of one's shirt causes hatred and bickering. It is not merely the opposition of nation against nation that Fascism, Nazism and Communism tend to cultivate. They produce dissensions within each separate State; even within the family itself. This general enmity does not, of course, imply that each man is entirely for himself and antagonistic to all others. On the contrary, the units concerned are large. They are cemented by living ideals. Territorial limits are overstepped, thus heightening the confusion by the overlapping of one unit into the other. This is the important characteristic of the struggle that each combatant is a very definite unit comprising many hundreds of men. The unity therefore which needs restoration so urgently is not a unity of thousands of heterogeneous individuals, so much as a unity of ideal among a number of compact and powerful groups. We have to aim at restoring order to a solar system, rather than at marshalling an unruly pack of hounds.

Conflict in living ideals means a conflict in religions; for a religion in general terms is the worship of some living ideal. The modern crisis is born of a conflict of enthusiastic worshippers. Nicholas Berdyaev shows us

this religious aspect in Communism. "It is impossible," he says, "to understand Communism if one sees in it only a social system. But one can comprehend the passionate tone of anti-religious propaganda and persecution in Soviet Russia, if one sees Communism as a *religion*. . . . Only a religion is characterized by the claim to possess absolute truth: no political or economic movement can claim that. . . . Communism persecutes all religion because it is itself a religion."<sup>1</sup>

The problem of human unity is the problem of solving the tangle of ideals and antagonistic religions by effecting an actually catholic religion. The true elements of each religion must be selected with a view to incorporating them in the one all-embracing truth, while the false elements are destroyed. The ideal may appear unattainable, but only a coward would refuse to attempt its realization, since one can count on God as an ally.

Throughout the last twenty centuries there has existed a religion always making for unity. The Church survived the fall of Rome and the passing of the Middle Ages. Moreover, she has been the fountain-head of culture for the whole of the West. Like a stately Doric column firmly built she has survived the collapse around her, being the model and inspiration of the rebuilding of the temple of civilization. We know that the Church will survive also the present collapse, while we claim for her the possession of the one Truth capable of setting order in the house of the West. The union of the Catholic Church must form the nucleus for the unity of the modern world, which means that the members of this Church will have to fight with vigour and daring for this unification. There can be no doubt that it means a desperate struggle; for, while the religion of nationalism, as found in Nazism and Fascism, may find its place in the internationalism of the Church by peaceful arrangement, Communism in its materialist conceptions presents a complete antithesis to that internationalism. Swiftly the arena is being cleared for the contest of these two remaining powers, Communism and Catholicism. These two religions with their opposing ideals demand from their members exclusive allegiance. The struggle will therefore be bitter, requiring every

<sup>1</sup> *The Russian Revolution*, pp. 87-88.



ounce of strength from each. It will go hard with the one who finally succumbs. By faith we can predict the final victor with certainty, yet before ultimate victory the Church may suffer apparent defeat, and be driven back into the catacombs.

The Church in her public prayers often asks that she may be spared persecution and injury to her members. "Da quaesumus Ecclesiae tuae, misericors Deus, ut Sancto Spiritu congregata, hostili nullatenus incursione turbetur." As a true mother she continues to make this petition even after experience has shown that persecution brings new vitality and vigour to the persecuted. We cannot piously clasp our hands waiting for the blow to fall. Our duty lies in the furtherance of that unity which the Church alone can bring. If we use the prayer against persecutors we must suit our actions to our words. Before we hope to achieve this union by overcoming Communism, we must foster our own strength, for which unity is an absolute essential. In his pamphlet on Unemployment, Mr. Gill has pointed out where the essence of the Church's union is to be found. The Church, he says, is a "society of all men united not as fathers and mothers, not as neighbours, not as a nation, not as workers or traders, but as passengers. Passengers on a ship or a railway train are united not as men and women, not because they are in the same cabin or compartment or deck (First Class, etc.), not because they are officers or deck hands or engineers, not because they speak the same language in the dining saloon, but because they are all going the same way." The bark of Peter, however, demands a closer union of those on board than merely that of being all passengers. Though their destination may be the same, the passengers' view of it may vary considerably. Some may be going there for pleasure, others for business, some for crime, others to pray. But the Church as the Mystic Body of Christ must necessarily be composed of members united here and now in aim and ideal.

As regards the present situation, many excellent works are being performed. Scarcely an issue of a Catholic paper lacks its anti-Communist article. Everywhere well instructed Catholics are pointing out the errors and dangers of Communism. There is a large number of societies which at least indirectly oppose that new reli-

gion. Yet in spite of this praiseworthy activity, something seems to be lacking. The weakness could not be described as pronounced; but, since every fibre and sinew must be tested for the impending struggle, we must investigate any trace of deficiency.

This danger-spot in our defences is due to a certain lack of unity found in three forms. First, the major part of Catholic action lies somewhat excessively in the natural sphere, neglecting the essential feature of Catholic unity, the foundation on Christ the Son of God, in the supernatural order. All Catholics should use their natural reason and capabilities to cope with modern problems. To restrict activity to that level is entirely another question. It is like fixing shafts to a modern car and attempting a chariot race with a cart-horse pulling the thing. Catholic vitality, restricted exclusively to the natural order, will at its best be merely on equal terms with Communism. Catholics experiment with one remedy after another. These may become intellectual convictions but are seldom related and inspired by the supernatural unifying life of the Church. There is little of that religious enthusiasm characteristic of their opponents. Yet the Catholic has the opportunity of vitalizing his action by a far more powerful religion. The apathy in Catholic circles and the uselessness of many of their good works arise from that pernicious habit of relegating the supernatural to night prayers and church-going on Sundays, while modern troubles and their relief are placed in an entirely different category on a footing with "business." The infinite resources of the Faith remain to a large extent untapped. Catholics do not realize that their only chance of success lies in a supernaturalizing of all their activity.

In the second place, as a result of this concentration on the purely natural, Catholic activity has become too diffuse. It is the complaint of the Pope in the concluding sentences of the *Quadragesimo Anno*. "No one indeed is unaware of the many and splendid works of the social and economic field, as well as in education and religion, laboriously set in motion with indefatigable zeal by Catholics. But this admirable and self-sacrificing activity not unfrequently loses some of its effectiveness by being directed into too many different channels. Let, then, all men of good-will stand united." Scattered in so many

directions, some of which are hardly reconcilable with one another; Catholic activity is perforce disconnected, thus losing strength. An army is more weakened by deficient lines of communication than by the loss of a large number of men. We may present a united front to the outsider, but it will be merely superficial if we continue to dissipate our energies in this manner.

The third point of weakness is to be found in the method of attack. The usual tactics are those of direct attack. Anti-communism is the fashion. People are inclined to wave red rags at the bull of Moscow before securing their own position. Direct attack has its importance and necessity, but at least it is not primary in matters of religion. The Church did not gain her supremacy over paganism by pointing out where paganism was at fault; she obtained the strength to convert Europe from the seed of internal union and harmony.

If such is the disease, where is the cure to be found? The answer we offer may sound strange to many. It is to be found, we maintain, in the Liturgy. Catholic action tends to neglect the united effort and religious enthusiasm, which are the source of so much strength to the Communists. Concentration on these two necessary elements would enable us to survive a cataclysm far more violent than the present. An enthusiasm is required which will bind both the individual to Christ and the individuals to one another. Solidarity and communal effort, springing from a profound conviction of Catholic supernatural truth, will provide the only efficient safeguards against these three weak points in the Catholic defences. It is precisely the duty of the liturgy to inspire this enthusiasm and to accomplish this solidarity. To convert the world by the liturgy may seem a completely fantastic conception; yet there is more sense in it as an ideal than at first appears.

The first step in the pursuit of this ideal is to trace the elaborate and beautiful services of the Church to their source. Christ, of course, instituted the liturgy in germ. We find that the main, central Christian liturgy, performed by Christ and commanded by Him to be observed throughout His Church, was that of the Last Supper. Around that one simple act of supreme worship has grown up the flower of Christian worship. While the root has remained the same, the external ceremonies have

been increased and perfected in order to celebrate that one mystery in a fitting manner. Hence, from the breaking of bread from house to house developed the High Mass, all the Divine Office and the whole liturgical year. It is not a mere question of history. The Mass must always hold the central place in Christian worship. The Holy Eucharist is the centre of all the other sacraments, while the Mass gives meaning to the Divine Office and all the other ceremonies of the Church. Abbot Cabrol states this well in his book on Liturgical Prayer. "The institution of the Eucharist as the central point exercises its law of attraction over the whole system of Christian worship. The Vigil has become the obligatory introduction to the Mass, and all the canonical hours which spring from the Vigil have been, through it, connected with the Mass. The sacraments and great liturgical ceremonies are in their turn drawn towards the furnace whence light and heat are diffused over the whole Christian life; baptism and confirmation, penance, holy orders, the consecration of virgins, the dedication of churches, the consecration of Bishops, the ceremonial of the dead—all these converge towards the holy Eucharist, like tributary streams flowing into a great river. . . ."<sup>2</sup> When therefore we speak of the liturgy, we mean primarily the Mass; and the Mass becomes the essential link of Christian unity.

To take first of all the beautiful but only external garment which clothes this deep mystery, it will be found that even here the liturgy encourages unification among the members of the Church. Attendance at this ceremony has been imposed as an obligation of membership, so that theoretically the whole Catholic world is present at least once a week. This is the main symbol of the catholicity of the Church. Moreover, within each particular church building there exists this external symbol of unity: the whole building and those present centre round the one important point, the priest at the altar, like that exciting buzzing brown mass that is a swarm of bees all intent on the central figure of the queen. These men and women of all ranks bow down together, rise up together and sometimes unite in making the same sounds and musical notes. At a certain moment of the service they all offer their coins. Even from a glimpse of these externals an

<sup>2</sup> English Translation, p. 171.

outsider would have to admit some semblance of human unity.

But all these exterior signs only have value and meaning in so far as they are either expressing outwardly, or leading towards, a deep interior union of the spirit; otherwise one might cover up the windows and turn the place into a cinema. This interior union of the Mass has such depth that it is hard to do it justice in human words. Christ necessarily holds the central position as the unique mediator between God and man. The Sacrifice of Calvary by its redemptive power united the human race once more to God through Christ, while the Mass is the same sacrifice applied immediately to our particular persons.

In virtue of His supreme and eternal priesthood Christ has offered to the Father that one all-powerful sacrifice of Calvary. By granting a participation in this priesthood to His Church, He has made it possible for us every day to offer this same sacrifice: in fact, the main difference between the Sacrifice of Calvary and the same sacrifice in the Mass is that while the same Victim is offered in both, in the former Christ offers Himself in person and in the latter He offers Himself through His ministers and His people. In the Mass Christ is the principal High Priest offering Himself as a victim through the instrumentality of the visible priest; but by the sacramental character received at Baptism each of the faithful is a sharer in this priesthood. The layfolk do not share so fully in Christ's priesthood as does the priest at the altar; nevertheless the priesthood of the people is a profound and important truth. It begets a duty in each one of the faithful to offer that sacrifice, to join with the priest and with his fellows in offering Christ to the eternal Father. Such a doctrine is peculiar to the Christian faith, destroying completely that sense of utter separation between the sanctuary and the nave, the priest and the layman, a common feature in other religions. The Catholic is not a mere spectator, nor is it a question of being "present at" Mass on Sundays. Every Christian must *offer* Mass. Union with Christ means a participation in His Sacrifice and in His Priesthood.

Sacrifice, however, only possesses value for the offerer when the external oblation is the outward sign of the interior making-over to God of the whole self. Sacrifice is a sign of complete subjection to God. The offerer



identifies himself with the offering, so that in offering the Sacrifice of the Mass we identify ourselves with Christ. Christ became the divine Victim by willingly offering Himself, so we, in order to derive personal benefit from the Mass, must offer our wills united to His as fellow victims. If the Catholic shares the priesthood of Christ, he shares also the victim-hood. This is no new-fangled notion begotten of a fanatical, liturgical revival. St. Gregory the Great taught the same doctrine. "During this holy function (i.e., the Mass)," he says, "we must offer ourselves with compunction of heart as a sacrifice; for when we commemorate the mystery of the Passion of Our Lord, we must imitate that which we celebrate. The Mass will be for us a sacrifice to God, when we have made an offering of ourselves."<sup>3</sup> Again it is implicit in many of the prayers in the Mass itself. After the priest has offered the bread and wine prepared for the sacrifice, he prays: "In the spirit of humility and with contrite heart may *we* (the plural is significant) be received by thee, Lord; and thus may our sacrifice be received by thee to-day and be pleasing to thee, Lord God." From our point of view this interior self-oblation in union with Christ is the central notion of the Mass.

We speak in general terms of sacrifices we make in daily life—the sacrifices of time, labours, energy and so forth. All those acts of giving up, offering up, doing without things for the love of God can be linked up with this one great sacrifice; for they all belong to the state of victim and of self-oblation. We may go further by offering—in the sense of accepting willingly—all those innumerable sufferings which we are asked to bear throughout our lives. Sickness, loss of friends, pain of body and of mind, all these inevitable sufferings may be united to the sufferings of Christ. Thus we may become co-victims with Christ, fellow-sufferers, sympathizers in the fundamental sense of this word. Even non-Catholics recognize in general terms the value of this the true attitude to suffering. When this idea is transformed into the sharing of Christ's suffering in active participation in the Mass, an instrument is placed in the hands of the Catholic for overcoming all difficulties.

Finally comes the second very important aspect of the

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, IV, 59.

Mass, the receiving of that same Person just sacrificed. The sacramental reception of the sacrificed Christ is the most perfect symbol of unity, as also the great source of life and strength, in the Church. It will be sufficient to quote Karl Adam: "The Mass is never an individual act, but always essentially a community act; and this is not merely in the sense that the whole community should take part in it, but also and emphatically in the sense that participation in the one Bread gives the community its true cohesion and unity, and builds it up into the supernatural organism of the Body of Christ, in which form it is presented to the Father by the hand of the divine High Priest. The ultimate meaning of Holy Communion . . . is that it is union with Christ and through Christ with all His members."<sup>4</sup>

The application of this fundamental conception of the liturgy to the present discussion will not be hard to grasp, since from first to last the central idea is one of unity and communion. Without a detailed application the conclusions will be sufficiently obvious. First, the liturgy should provide a strong antidote against disintegration and dissipation in the life of each individual. The Mass is the centre of all the sacraments. All prayers and devotions should similarly centre round it. The Mass can be made to catch up within itself all the daily sufferings and sacrifices, as well as the daily pleasures and all our activities. For each Catholic the Mass can become the magnetic pole giving meaning to an otherwise disjointed, haphazard life. The most paltry occupations can thus become means of ever closer union to the one centre, Christ. The Mass is the great means of instilling strength and enthusiasm into the individual life.

Then, too, this liturgy has the capacity of binding all the faithful together in entire concord. The primary means of effecting this is indirect; for, since each individual is thus united to Christ, it follows that he is united to all his brethren in Christ, in the same way that my hands are united to one another, because they are both members of the same body and in communion with the head. The cohesion of the faithful is also directly effected by true participation in the liturgy. A group of people consciously offering the same sacrifice

<sup>4</sup> *Christ Our Brother*, p. 74.

must necessarily become more compact, more sympathetic, more united in ideal and aim. They receive the same Life, the same spiritual food at Holy Communion, which in this context becomes more than a personal and private visit from Christ; it becomes an act of social significance as well. Nor must we forget that the external harmony expressed in the liturgical functions and setting, if based on this internal spirit of worship, provides also a powerful means of unification. The result of such an act of worship should be true brotherhood in Christ, a perfect comradeship.

Opponents of the Church, such as the Communists, place their chief appeal and propaganda value in their claim to rid the world of injustice, suffering and pain. But the Catholic position, fortified by the liturgy, is far more sound. Accepting the consequences of the Fall, every Catholic is ready to admit the inevitability of these evils. Moreover, in the spirit of sacrifice he is ready to accept them in their inevitability and make them a means of advance as Christ made suffering the means of the redemption of the world. The spirit inculcated by the Mass is one which strives with all its energy to alleviate and remove pain, but when any suffering proves inevitable, then to accept it willingly. For the spirit of the Mass is the spirit of sympathy as well as of sacrifice.

In this manner conscious participation in the liturgy of the Church will give the right orientation to the whole of Catholic action. It will give that united strength and vital spirit of enthusiasm which has been shown to be somewhat lacking among the faithful in three respects. For, by uniting each member more closely to Christ, and by making the Mass the centre of all human activity, the principle of action will necessarily become supernatural. All as fellow-sufferers with Christ will be willing to forego much personal comfort for the sake of the greater spiritual good. Material prosperity will not figure quite so predominantly on the programme. Thus all our actions, in whatever sphere, will be motivated by one supernatural aim, so that the full powers of the Church will be let loose in a torrent on the world. Moreover, this would gather the stray threads now lying scattered, without much apparent connection with the one central point of the Church. People would begin

to feel that they were primarily Catholics, not primarily Distributists, Capitalists or Social Workers. Differences of opinion would be laid aside with a consequent concentration of activity. One could almost prophesy a complete consensus of opinion among Catholics on how to solve modern problems, if the Mass were to be made the source of all Catholic action. Another consequence would be the preoccupation with internal union begotten of the true spirit of Christ. We could let the Communist rage without fearing any panic within our own ranks. We should feel strong enough to ignore his menaces, which would probably disarm him far more quickly than any direct attack with much shouting and gesticulation. No Catholic would be enticed into the enemy's camp by the promise of universal brotherhood professed under the Red Flag, because all would recognize the far deeper and more perfect brotherhood of the Church. For the liturgy above all things shows the true communism of complete spiritual communion with material inequality. The liturgy also shows the true nationalism, Greek and Latin rites, French and English congregations, going hand in hand with most perfect internationalism. The superiority of the Church is apparent here, for since the day of Adam no fundamental human unity has been possible unless it has been guided by, and has flowed from, some superhuman source. The Church's unity is not mere human unity; it is a human unity based on a Person, Christ the Son of the living God.

We have endeavoured to show that it is by means of the liturgy that we can make this human unity at once more intense among ourselves and at the same time gradually override all other antagonistic human unities, eventually to restore equilibrium to this tottering age. It may be objected that the thesis is the same as the forlorn hope that men will some day cease sinning to lead holy and contented lives. The censure may be deserved, but at least there is here stated a definite and practical means whereby man may begin to lay aside sin and don the garment of the blessed in a union both human and divine.

## THE PROGRESS OF MONEY-REFORM

BY THE REV. F. H. DRINKWATER.

**I**N all ages Usury has been recognized as Public Enemy No. 1, but modern Usury has been so successful and dominant that most people have forgotten its true name. Repeatedly during the last two or three centuries its operations have been exposed for what they are; as for instance by Bishop Berkeley in the eighteenth century, by Napoleon (if Dr. McNair Wilson is right) in the early nineteenth, and by the Catholics of the Fribourg school in the 'seventies. But every time so far the Money Power has managed to suppress the discovery and turn public attention to other affairs.

The present movement for the reform of Money and Credit may be dated from the War. True, there were pioneers in pre-War days, especially Silvio Gesell, who died quite lately, and Arthur Kitson, happily still living. But the gigantic orgy of usury known as the War Loans, and the evidence about banking facts (previously unrealized by the general public) given before the Macmillan Committee, combined to give the monetary-reform movement a momentum which shows no sign of decreasing.

Some of the reformers, such as Eisler abroad and Hawtrey in England (one might almost add Mr. McKenna) have confined themselves to showing how the Banking system itself might use its powers for the public good. They advocate stabilized prices, managed currencies, large-scale public works, or other measures of common sense. Sometimes they are listened to by Central Bankers, more often apparently not. In any case they have no criticism to make of the money-lender as such, nor of the whole system of Public Debt. They can hardly be counted as real Monetary Reformers.

Immediately after the War, however, we find Major C. H. Douglas pointing out the disastrous consequences of the private monopoly of money and credit, and suggesting certain remedies of his own for those consequences. How far Douglas was acquainted with the ideas of



Kitson and others I do not know. The Douglas doctrines (analysis and proposals) were taken up by Mr. A. R. Orage, the brilliant editor then of the *New Age* and now of the *New English Weekly*. Other leaders of the attack on Usury worthy of mention are Dr. McNair Wilson, Professor Soddy, C. M. Hattersley, Eimar O'Duffy, Christopher Hollis, and (if I understand him rightly) Mr. Isidor Ostrer, who owns the *Sunday Referee*. These have all arrived more or less independently at the same attitude towards private credit-control, but in the rest of their diagnosis and proposals they are not in accord with Douglas, though some are nearly so. With these may be included the "New Britain Movement," which was launched over a year ago with a cargo of political ideas mostly excellent, and a strong bias to monetary reform; but its staying-power remains to be proved.

The Douglas section of all this movement is important because it is well organized, and staying-power is its strong point. It calls itself the "Douglas Social Credit" movement (D.S.C. for short) to distinguish itself from the heterodox; it has numerous groups all over the English-speaking world, and a Secretariat in London; and quite a number of well-edited periodicals, of which the latest and much the best is *Social Credit* (twopence weekly, from 8, Essex Street, W.C.2). It has even a militant wing of "Green-shirts," under a leader of forceful personality named John Hargrave, who speak at street-corners and act as stewards at public meetings. One way and another, it is safe to say that everybody will hear a good deal about Douglas Social Credit in the near future.

What are the Douglasite doctrines? In the first place, they demand that the issue of money and credit should be under the control of the King's Government and used for the good of the community. Such a demand, of course, is justified by every law of God and man. Secondly, they point out that when money is issued solely through "production" (i.e., through loans to industry, as it is at present) there is never enough purchasing-power in the hands of the poor consumer; so they propose to issue credits not only to producers but also direct to consumers, and they want to do this in the form of a "national dividend" to all citizens. This is a startling idea at first, but the more it is

considered the more necessary and inevitable it seems. Anyhow, these two Douglas proposals—the national control of credit-issue and the national dividend—are held not only by the Douglasites but by all those I have called real monetary reformers.

There are at least two other dogmas, however, without which (according to the Douglas groups) there is no salvation. One is called the "A+B Theorem," and is a complicated explanation of how there comes to be a shortage of purchasing-power; in its crudest forms it is untrue, and in any case it does not matter much. The other is a proposal called the Compensated Retail Price, which is merely one out of many possible devices for avoiding "inflation." These two unessential details have been elevated by the Douglasite veterans into sacred tests of orthodoxy, which is unfortunate because they are so easy to attack and argue about for weeks. When you hear that "the Douglas scheme has been disproved," or that "nobody can understand what it means," it is nearly always one of these unnecessary "principles" that is referred to.

Major Douglas himself (one imagines) is more open-minded and adaptable than some of his lieutenants are. He has lately come back from a world-tour in North America, Australasia, and South Africa, and his first public utterance on his return was to urge his followers to make a house-to-house canvass of the whole electorate with a view to getting Members of Parliament to take up the National Dividend as a policy. This is certainly simplifying Douglas Social Credit with a vengeance. How far it means a deliberate change of emphasis away from the "A+B Theorem," and similar handicaps, remains to be seen. The Douglas Secretariat, the governing body of the movement, hitherto more or less self-appointed, is about to go through an election-process for the first time, and conceivably this may make a difference in many ways.

Another indication pointing in the same direction is the founding of a "League to Abolish Poverty," which held its inaugural meeting early in October in the same hall which saw the inaugural meeting of the campaign for Old Age Pensions in 1898. The chief speaker on the new League's platform was that saintly and attractive figure the Dean of Canterbury. The "League to Abolish

"Poverty" was started by the Marquis of Tavistock and other prominent Douglasites, and its objective is consumer-credit in the form of "a national dividend which shall be sufficient to guarantee every man and woman, and every family in the land, security against Poverty"; the interesting thing is that it is explicitly *not* identified with the Douglas system and its particular complications.

If it can preserve that freedom (which at the moment of writing seems rather doubtful) the League to Abolish Poverty is certainly an activity in which I would recommend Catholics to join.

In the October CLERGY REVIEW Fr. Lewis Watt agrees with Père Faidherbe that our moralists have hardly done their duty by the virtue of distributive justice. Not long ago I listened to a lecture by a well-known Catholic exponent of social teaching; the title announced was "Usury"; the first part of the lecture was devoted to discovering the grounds on which the taking of interest could be justified, and the second half to showing that this teaching was not really inconsistent with that of the mediæval theologians. All true enough, no doubt, but is that all there is to say about Usury in the year 1934, when the material gifts of God are plentiful beyond all the dreams of our forefathers, while all the nations are groaning under mountainous burdens of Debt which are crushing whole populations into a universal insecurity and millions of people into actual want of the necessities of life? In such circumstances there is something rather unnatural in any Catholic being, or through ignorance of the facts even seeming to be, on the side of the Great Usurers.

Here are two or three easy books which anyone interested in Monetary Reform should know:

*This Age of Plenty*, by C. M. Hattersley (Pitman, 3s. 6d.).

*Promise to Pay*, by J. McNair Wilson (Routledge, 3s. 6d.).

*The Breakdown of Money*, by C. Hollis (Sheed & Ward, 4s. 6d.).

*The Bankers' Conspiracy*, by A. Kitson (Elliot Stock, 2s. 6d.).

*The Douglas Manual*, by P. Mairet (Nott, 5s.).

## CAPITALIZED DEVOTIONS

BY THE REV. R. A. KNOX, M.A.

CAN anything be done about Catholic printing? I extract the following from *The Pilgrim's Companion*, published by the Catholic Truth Society for the benefit of those who go to Lourdes:

"O thou Memorial of our Lord's own dying!  
O Bread that Living art and vivifying!  
Make ever Thou my soul on Thee to live;  
Ever a taste of Heavenly sweetness give."

Now, what is the sense of the capital letters printed in that verse? If we have "Thou" and "Thee" in the third line, why not "Thou" in the first? And why not "That" in the second line, since it is a relative pronoun referring to the Blessed Sacrament? If "Living," why not "Vivifying"? And if "Living," why not "Dying"—especially as "living," is an adjective, whereas "dying" is a noun, and translates *mortis* in the Latin? And why should "Heavenly" suddenly blossom out into a capital? True, we write "Heaven" sometimes, but we also write "Hell"; would anybody ask to be delivered from "the Hellish designs" of Satan? And why does the English version need seven capital letters and two shriek-marks to produce its effect, whereas the Latin, printed opposite, has only one capital letter (*Domini*), and no shriek-marks?

I have never gone into the history of capital letters, but a few general considerations may be adduced. In very early printing such as that of Blessed Thomas More's Dialogue, capital letters are used sparingly, perhaps from poverty of type; occasionally you find "god" and "christ" so printed, and "church" is invariable. In books of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, we expect to find capital letters given to common nouns, as in the ordinary German script; though in England the practice never seems to have been uniform, and it is difficult to see why (for example) a Camden's *Britannia* printed in 1722 should tell us that Sir Thomas Bodley "furnish'd a new Library in the same place, with the best Books procur'd from all parts of the World." In any case, by the 1790's this had died out, and capitals were reserved for proper names (nouns or adjectives), for institutions like "Parliament" which were almost proper names, and certain *nouns* which

had definitely religious associations, e.g., "the Passion" of our Lord. At the time of the Oxford Movement, more or less, some printer's devil seems to have invented the idea that we could do God service by giving capital letters to pronouns. Newman's sermons, published while he was yet an Anglican, have the printing "Him", "His", etc., wherever a divine Person is referred to; so does Ward's *Ideal*, published in 1844. Catholics had no such habit; the small initial letter is used, for example, in Wiseman's reply to Turton, and in the reprints of Challoner and Milner produced about the same date. It looks as if the Tractarians brought in the capital letter with them; by the 'sixties it had become almost universal. Quite recently, the principle has been extended; we refer to the Blessed Sacrament as "It" (Dalgairns does not); the Sacred Heart is sometimes honoured after the same fashion. Quite recently, too, though I think more rarely, you will find "Her" used of our Lady (e.g., Bonetti's *Life of Dom Bosco*, published by Burns and Oates).

Can anything be done about Catholic printing?

At least it may be suggested to publishers that they should abolish forthwith, in the correction of proof-sheets, the two ridiculous forms "Our Lord" and "Our Lady." The capital initial given to the possessive pronoun clearly serves to honour the possessor, not that which is possessed. "Thine we are, and Thine we wish to be" means "we wish to be of Thee." By parity of reasoning, "Our Lord" means "the Lord of Us"; it may be used by the Holy Father, or by a bishop in writing a pastoral letter; the ordinary priest or layman is guilty of an illiteracy if he does so. Think over this, printer's reader, if printer's readers ever do think over anything they print.

But now, about the major problem—is there no chance of returning to the sane typography of our great-grandfathers? If our bibles, our missals, our breviaries have "sanctificetur nomen tuum," why must we translate it "hallowed be Thy name"? I have by me a book entitled "The Priest's New Ritual, for the Greater Convenience of the Reverend Clergy of the United States of America"; why is it a convenience to them to have "hallowed be Thy name" printed side by side with "que votre nom soit sanctifié"? (Though, indeed,



the serpent is beginning to rear its head in France, too, and even in Italy.) A decently printed book, like Burns and Oates' *Ordo Administrandi*, is content with the small letter. So is their missal for the laity; Adrian Fortescue knew his business.

My objections to the barbarism in question are three-fold:

(i.) It is bad printing, and disfigures the page. To see that, you have only to cast your eye at a sentence like this (from the *Spiritual Exercises*):

Jerusalem is filled with the news of His triumph; the judges who condemned Him are confounded; the soldiers, who insulted Him as a seducer and a madman are the first witnesses of His glory; His disciples and Apostles, who had abandoned Him everywhere, proclaim His resurrection."

Capital H's or capital T's sprawling patternlessly over the page offend the eye like newspaper headlines. Worse, they distract the brain, which (if we are reading rapidly) is concerned to pick up information from the nouns chiefly; hence the German practice. There is no seeing the wood for the trees when you are confronted with a line like this:

See, from His head, His hands, His feet.

If reverence demands capitals, why not:

See, from his Head, his Hands, his Feet,

which has the additional advantage of picking out the sense for you as you read? Though, to be sure, no capitals at all were necessary. Reading, after all, is tiring work; for the priest especially, whose Mass and office are a first claim upon the eye's capacities. Why burden us with these gratuitous irregularities of type? They mean nothing.

(ii.) Catholic literature is not meant exclusively for pious Christians. Its aims should be to make itself readable to the careless, the worldly, if possible. Why, then, distress these profane eyes with an oleaginous over-emphasis of piety? The harm, to be sure, is done subconsciously for the most part, but it is done nevertheless. There is an unfamiliarity about the very look of the page, in any book recommended as spiritual reading, which hardens the layman's resolution to put it down the moment your back is turned.

(iii.) Try as he will, the printer never manages to get his practice uniform. Here, in this Lourdes book, the *Ave maris stella* shows the words "thou", "thyself", "Thee", "thy", "Thee", as if it were a matter of complete indifference. I have by me a copy of Cardinal Mercier's Retreat for his priests, in which the words occur (used of our Lord) "pour sa gloire, Il se plait à les apaiser." Why not "Il Se plait", or "il se plait"? There is no sense in the thing.

The pronouns are my nightmare; but much could be done to regularize our use of capitals in other parts of speech. The adjective, I should claim, ought only to have a capital where it forms, with its noun, the equivalent of a single proper name; as, the Holy Land, the Sacred Heart, the Blessed Sacrament. Otherwise, no common adjective can possibly claim such a distinction, unless it be the word "Divine," which relates directly to God. As for nouns, I can only plead with the faithful to spare the reader's eye, so far as that can be done without prejudice to theological decorum. Pilgrims, according to the manual, should refer to England as our Lady's dowry when they are at Lourdes; as her Dowry when they are in St. John Lateran.

Do not say that we have grown accustomed to the modern habit, and the faithful would be scandalized if we forsook it. In all my books, I have never printed a pronoun (except "I") with a capital letter in it; and although printers have persecuted me without a cause, there has been no complaint from the faithful, from the reviewers, or even from a *censor deputatus*. Do not say that the modern habit serves, occasionally, to make the meaning of a sentence clear. The man who cannot make the meaning of a sentence clear without typographical artifice should never be allowed to appear in print.

If only the C.T.S., Burns and Oates, Sheed and Ward would combine to give us a lead, we would clear up our printing mess in a decade. Anglican papers, please copy; for, indeed, our separated brethren, or if they prefer it our Separated Brethren, are in this matter no better than ourselves.

I look forward to reading the proofs of this article.

## THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION SERVICE AND THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

BY THE REV. E. C. MESSENGER, Ph.D.

CATHOLICS have long been familiar with attempts, varying in audacity, to maintain that the Anglican liturgy teaches, or at any rate does not deny, the Sacrifice of the Mass, as taught by the Catholic Church. Thus we have never ceased to marvel at the attempt to distinguish in the famous Article 31, between the "sacrifices of masses" and the "Sacrifice of the Mass." It is not our intention here to discuss that article, but to examine a recent attempt to read the Sacrifice of the Mass into the Communion Service, and in particular into that service as found in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, published in 1549. The interest of this attempt is obvious: if it can be maintained that this first Communion Service teaches the sacrifice of the Mass, it can be argued, with a certain amount of plausibility, that the "priesthood" of which the Church of England speaks in her Ordinal of 1550, is a "sacrificing priesthood." In other words, it may be urged that the Ordinal ought to be interpreted in the light of the Communion Service of 1549 which preceded it, and not in the light of the service of 1552 which followed it.<sup>1</sup>

This conception of the Communion Service of the First Prayer Book was already suggested by Dr. Darwell Stone in his *History of the Holy Eucharist* published in 1909. Thus he writes:

"The new office (for the Eucharist) did not contain any sign of a change of doctrine. . . . At the administration the consecrated elements are called 'the Sacrament of the Body of Christ' . . . As regards the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, the prayer of oblation included the passages: 'Wherefore . . . we make here the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make . . . desiring Thy fatherly goodness . . . to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. . . And here we offer . . . ourselves . . . to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee. . . And, although we be unworthy . . . to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of Thy holy angels, to be brought up into Thy holy tabernacle before the sight of Thy divine majesty' " (Vol. II, p. 136).

We may here interpolate the remark that the last part of this quotation with its reference to "prayers and supplications" as the matter of "sacrifice" obviously destroys Brightman's contention, for it is based evidently upon the sentence in the Canon: "jube haec perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui in

<sup>1</sup> An argument actually advanced by an Anglican clergyman to the present writer in the course of a public discussion at Oxford.

sublime altare tuum, in conspectu divinae Majestatis tuae, ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione, etc.," where the "haec" at the beginning refers back to the "hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitae aeternae, et calicem salutis perpetuae" in the "Unde et memores," with its definite phrase "offerimus praeclarae Majestati tuae, de tuis donis ac datis"—all phrases which are conspicuous by their absence in the Anglican rite. It is significant that the latest author to write on the subject, the Rev. T. J. Jalland, to whom we shall refer shortly, omits the last part of this quotation from the Anglican canon, and ends with "duty and service."

However, to return to Dr. Darwell Stone. He continues:

"In all these respects, the Prayer Book of 1549 . . . would be naturally understood as giving expression to the same doctrine as that contained in the order and canon of the Mass, while like the order and canon of the Mass and liturgical works generally, it did not commit those who used it to one opinion or to another, as to whether the substance of the bread and wine remains after consecration, or as to the exact nature of the Eucharistic sacrifice" (op. cit., p. 138).<sup>2</sup>

The theory, of course, needed a more detailed justification, and this the late Canon Brightman attempted to provide. He wrote, for instance, in the *Dictionary of English Church History* in 1912: "The Mass reproduces the structure and much of the contents of the Roman, the admirable paraphrase of the Canon (affected considerably by the *Antididagma* of Cologne) making explicit the commemorative character of the act" (p. 130).<sup>3</sup> Here

(1) The Decrees of the Council of Cologne of 1536, which oppose the Reformation;

(2) the *Encheiridion*, a full explanation of the Catholic doctrines disputed by the Reformers, written probably by John Groepper, whom Rivière describes as "la gloire de l'Eglise de Cologne," and who represented the See of Cologne at the Council of Trent. This was written about 1537.

(3) In 1530, however, three years after the Provincial Council, Hermann von Wied, Archbishop of Cologne, came under the influence of Melancthon and Bucer, went over to the Lutheran party, and published a Lutheran work and service book, entitled in its Latin form, *Simplex et Pia Consultatio*, written in great part by the two Reformers just mentioned. To this work we shall refer later. It greatly influenced the Anglican Reformed Liturgy.

(4) The *Antididagma*, written against the Lutheran *Pia Consultatio* of the Archbishop by the orthodox Chapter of Cologne, probably for the most part by John Groepper, and published in 1544. It is a very full explanation and defence of Catholic doctrine on the Mass, the Sacraments, etc., against the Lutheran objections.

Two years after the appearance of this work, i.e. in 1546, Archbishop Hermann was excommunicated, and in 1547 deprived of his position.

It is of the utmost importance to note that there were two English translations of the Lutheran *Simplex et Pia Consultatio*, i.e., in 1547 and

<sup>2</sup> A later author, the Rev. C. Smyth, in his study on Cranmer (Cambridge University Press), says similarly that "The First Prayer Book is characterized by conservatism and moderation. . . It was intended to be sufficiently comprehensive to include the Catholic party of reform. . ."

<sup>3</sup> For the sake of the uninitiated reader, we may point out that there are four works of interest and importance in connection with the Reformation at Cologne:

again in 1548, but *there were no English versions of the Encheiridion or the Antididagma*. This is most significant.

we have the first suggestion that the Anglican "Prayer of Consecration" is really based upon a Catholic work, which itself clearly teaches the Sacrifice of the Mass! Details were given in Canon Brightman's two volumes on *The English Rite*, published in 1915, where we find the following given as sources:

## SOURCES

*Necessary Doctrine*, f.d.ii: "Our Saviour Christ hath offered Himself upon the Cross a sufficient redemption and satisfaction for the sins of all the world."

*Antididagma*, 1544 (1) fol. lvi: per Christum semel in cruce . . . plenarie et sufficienter impetrata;

(2) lxiii: qui seipsum. . . Deo patri coelesti cruentum sacrificium pro peccatis mundi obtulit . . . semel in cruce oblatum;

(3) lvi: praecepitque ut sanctissimum illud sacrificium patri coelesti iterum atque iterum ac semper quousque veniat, spiritualiter et commemorative offeramus.

## ANGLICAN RITE

O God, heavenly Father, which of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesu Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption, who made there (by His one oblation once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world, and did institute and in His holy Gospel command us, to celebrate a perpetual memory of that His precious death, until His coming again. . . .

On another page, Canon Brightman gives the following "sources" of the Anglican Canon: "*Antididagma*, fol. lviii.: Deinde offertur commune laudis et gratiarum actionis sacrificium pro tota ecclesia . . . Tertio, facta consecratione, Christus ipse offertur, corpus ejus et sanguis ejus, et sacratissima ipsius passio, per commemorationem et repraesentationem ejus. Ac quarta demum offertur Ecclesia ipsa et tota Christi communitas, quae se Deo patri in hac sacrosancta actione dedicat et sacrificat. *ibid.* fol. lxx. Ecclesia tradit et offert seipsam patri hostiam vivam votis spiritualibus."

Elsewhere, i.e., in the Introduction, Canon Brightman sets forth the theory thus:

The (Anglican) Canon is an eloquent paraphrase and expansion of the Roman Canon, adjusting it clearly to the conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as threefold, viz.:

(a) A commemoration of Our Lord's historical self-oblation in His death upon the Cross;

(b) as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, for the benefits of redemption so secured; and

(c) as the offering of the church, of ourselves, our souls and bodies, and centreing all sacrificial language on these three moments. With this cf. *Encheiridion*, f. lv: "Quatenus ergo ecclesia verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi Deo patri offert, sacrificium mere repraesentativum est ejus quod in cruce semel est peractum. Quatenus vero seipsam (quae est corpus Christi mysticum) per Christum offert, sequae ac sua omnia per Christum Deo dedicat, verum sed spirituale sacrificium est, Hoc est sacrificium eucharisticum, laudis, gratiarum actionis, et Deo propriae, debitae obedientiae."

Here we have a threefold sacrifice. The *Antididagma*, indeed.



as Brightman elsewhere remarks (p. lxix), speaks of four sacrifices :

Of particular interest (in the *Antididagma*) is the exposition of the fourfold sacrifice in the Eucharist :

(1) of the material offering of the bread and wine in acknowledgment of the divine benefits, at the offertory (fol. lviii.);

(2) of thanksgiving . . . ;

(3) of Christ, who "spirituali repraesentatione et commemoratione sacratissimae suae passionis offertur . . . figurative et spiritualiter, ad consequendam remissionem peccatorum (ff. lxviii. sq.); and

(4) of the whole Church (f. lxx.).

The same idea is set forth here and there in the *Liturgy and Worship* volume published in 1932 by the S.P.C.K. Thus, in the section written by Canon Brightman, we are told that in the First Prayer Book :

"The structure of the (Roman) Canon is unaltered, except that one prayer is differently placed. . . . Hanc igitur is replaced by a commemoration of Our Lord's one oblation of Himself, and His Institution of the Eucharist as 'a perpetual memory' of it. . . . The following paragraph corresponds to 'Unde et memores' and 'Supra quae' : 'Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father. . . .'"

Similarly, Dr. Srawley, in his section on the "Communion Service" in the same work, says that the "Prayer of Consecration" in the 1549 Book was "a free adaptation, with considerable modification" of the Roman Canon. He continues :

"The preamble of the prayer resumes the commemoration of God's creative and redeeming work. In language which recalls phrases in the *Antididagma* . . . it speaks of Christ's 'full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction' for the sins of the whole world, and of the 'perpetual memory' of His death instituted by Him."

The latest author to take up and develop this idea is the Rev. T. Jalland, M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Oxford, in *This our Sacrifice*, published in 1933. Insofar as Mr. Jalland reproduces Brightman's material and argument, our criticism of the latter will apply to him also. But whereas Brightman tries to represent the Anglican rite as in line with the threefold sacrifice mentioned in the Cologne *Encheiridion*, Mr. Jalland goes one step further, and endeavours to find the fourfold sacrifice of the *Antididagma* in the Anglican rite. This fourfold sacrifice, it will be remembered, consists, according to the *Antididagma*, in the oblation of bread and wine, "with a mystical signification," at the Offertory. Next, "there is offered the common sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," thirdly, "when the consecration has taken place, Christ Himself is offered, His Body and Blood, and His most sacred Passion, by means of the commemoration and re-presentation of it; and lastly, the whole Church is offered."

We agree that the Anglican rite contains the *second* and *fourth*, i.e., the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and the offering of ourselves. But we do not agree that it contains either the *first* (the offering of bread and wine) or the *third* (the offering of Christ's Body and Blood). As to the *first*, the oblation of

bread and wine, Mr. Jalland quotes this sentence from the "Prayer for the Church," "We humbly beseech Thee most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations." This "Prayer for the Church" comes indeed after the "Offertory" and before the Preface in the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI and subsequent editions, but even so, the reference to "oblations" was inserted only in 1662. And even now there is a rubric saying that "if there be no alms or oblations, then shall these words be left out unsaid," which makes it difficult to suppose that the words were ever intended to mean the elements of bread and wine, without which presumably there could be no Communion service! In the First Prayer Book the prayer in question formed part of the Canon, and read: "these our prayers." There was no mention of any oblations! In the Second Prayer Book it read: "accept our alms and receive these our prayers," and this form remained unchanged till 1662! The fact is that the whole of the Offertory prayers from the Catholic Mass, with their clear references to the offering of the bread and wine, have been completely eliminated from the Anglican rite, and have left no trace whatever. Mr. Jalland's attempt to find a trace is a dismal failure. As to the *third* sacrifice, when, according to the *Antididagma* "Christ himself is offered," the only equivalent Mr. Jalland can find is the phrase "most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that, by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy holy Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion." But here there is not the slightest reference to any offering of Christ at all! And it must be remembered that this is the phrase the Anglican Reformers chose to take the place of the *Unde et memores*!

We conclude, then, that so far from teaching the fourfold sacrifice, as Mr. Jalland would have us believe, the original Anglican rite definitely excluded the oblation of bread and wine and the offering of Christ's Body and Blood, and retained only the sacrifice of ourselves, and that of praise and thanksgiving.

Having said this, we can now turn to the "preamble" to the consecration in the Anglican rite, and the suggestion that this is really derived from the *Antididagma*.

In the first place, there is one strong presumption against it, consisting in the fact that the Communion Office of 1548 and the Communion Service in the First Prayer Book of 1549 were, by the consent of all, greatly influenced by the Lutheran "*Pia Consultatio*." According to the S.P.C.K. volume *Liturgy and Worship*, "about half" of the general confession in the service "is taken from Wied's Cologne Order" (p. 153), the absolution is prefixed by the opening clauses from the Cologne book, and three of the four "comfortable words" are taken from the same Lutheran source (*ibid.*). Is it likely that the framers of the Anglican liturgy would be so eclectic as to take part of their new service from a Lutheran work, and another part from the Catholic works opposed to it?

Secondly, the theory breaks down completely upon examination, as we can see from an examination of the context of the supposed "sources."

First, then, the *Antididagma* gives, on fol. lvi., a careful account of the institution of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Here is Dr. Darwell Stone's translation of the passage (I only give the essential portions, and I italicize the phrases which constitute Brightman's sources).

"Christ offered a sacrifice of a twofold kind when He went from this world to the Father. One was the bloody sacrifice on the Cross, where by the offering of His body and the shedding of His precious blood, He obtained for us remission of sins and eternal redemption. This sacrifice of the new law, offered once only on the Cross, is offered no more in like manner (*non amplius ita offertur*). That is the one sacrifice which has merited for us remission of sins and eternal life. . . . But when the heavenly Father determined to establish with us by the death of His only begotten Son a new covenant . . . He took care also to provide that a sacrifice harmonious to such a covenant, whereby we might be continually kept in mind of the covenant and league, should be instituted and manifested to us. Wherefore Christ the Lord, when He had willed to offer Himself once for us a bloody sacrifice . . . instituted and left to us a kind of image of His sacrifice (*sui sacrificii imaginem quandam*), as a sacrifice whereby we might thenceforth again and again offer sacrifice in the Church (*tanquam sacrificium quo iterum atque iterum subinde in Ecclesia sacrificaremus*). . ."

Now comes source No. 3 in Brightman :

*"He commanded that we should offer spiritually and by way of commemoration this most holy sacrifice to the heavenly Father again and again, and ever until He should come,"—*

And soon after comes source No. 1 :

*"not to merit remission of sins, as if remission had not been fully and sufficiently obtained through Christ once on the Cross for all believers, but for a memorial of that redemption of His, that is, that in these most holy mysteries we may ever mystically and in figure represent and set forth His passion and death to God the Father, and give Him thanks . . . so that thus, by spiritual representation and commemoration and thanksgiving of this kind, and particularly by the reception of His most holy sacrament, we may apply and appropriate to ourselves those divine gifts which have been procured."*

Source No. 2 consists in two phrases in a later passage not translated by Dr. Darwell Stone. Here it is :

*"When the consecration has taken place, Christ the Lord (who then offered Himself in His mortal body to God the heavenly Father as a bloody sacrifice for the sins of the world), now, in the name of the whole Church, in an unbloody manner, is offered by or in a spiritual representation and commemoration of His most holy passion. . . . For although that sacrifice in that form in which it was offered on the Cross was offered only once, and the blood shed only once, so that it may not be repeated or offered again in that way (ita), nevertheless, such a sacrifice remains and continues in presence of God perpetually accepted in its virtue and efficacy, so that that sacrifice once offered on the Cross is no less efficacious to-day in the sight of the Father, and powerful, than in that day when blood and water flowed from the Wounded Side. . . . Wherefore, seeing that the wounds of our wounded body always have need of the price of redemption, the Church sets forth to God the Father that same price in true faith and devotion, once more (but figuratively and spiritually), in order to obtain the remission of sins. Not that to this*

its work (by which namely it commemorates and represents His Sacrifice) it ascribes the merit of the remission of sins, for this only Christ merited for us by His bloody oblation on the Cross, but that by its commemoration of this kind and by the mystical sacrifice of faith, in which the Church represents and sets forth in the sight of the Father the true body and blood of His only begotten Son, it applies and accommodates to itself that great and inestimable gift of the remission of sins which Christ won."

Here, then, we have a perfectly correct and orthodox setting forth of the Catholic doctrine of the Mass. The last sentence, in which it is stated that the Sacrifice of the Mass applies the merit of the Sacrifice of the Cross is noteworthy, for this is a conception which was expressly denied by the "*Pia Consultatio*," to which the Anglican Liturgy was so much indebted. Cf. the following passage in the Cologne Lutheran work:

"Before all things the pastors must labour to take out of men's minds that false and wicked opinion whereby men think commonly that the priest in the Mass offereth up Christ our Lord to God the Father, after that sort that by his intention and prayer he causeth Christ to become a new and acceptable sacrifice to the Father for the salvation of men, applieth and communicateth (applicet et communicet) the merit of the Passion of Christ . . . to them that receive not the same with their own faith. . . . And whereas the Holy Fathers call the ministrations of this sacrament a Sacrifice and Oblation, and that the priest in administering the supper offereth Christ, let the preachers know and teach other when need shall be, that the Holy Fathers by the name of a sacrifice understood not application, which was devised a good while after the Fathers and prevailed with other abuses, but a solemn remembrance of the Sacrifice of Christ. . . . For while the Supper of the Lord is ministered as the Lord instituted it, the Sacrifice of Christ is celebrated and exhibited therein through the preaching of His death and the distribution of the sacraments."<sup>4</sup>

This statement could be paralleled from passages in Cranmer's own works. But if it is remembered that the work containing the above passage was translated into English in 1548 and 1549,<sup>5</sup> and that the First Prayer Book was published in the latter year, the real inspiration of the Prayer Book idea that the Communion Service is a "solemn remembrance" of the Sacrifice of the Cross is surely obvious. It comes from this Lutheran work, and not from the Catholic *Antididagma*. For in the latter, the phrases in which the Mass is described as a "commemoration" of the Passion are accompanied by others which make it quite plain that in the Mass *Christ is offered in sacrifice*—phrases which are conspicuous by their absence in both the Cologne Lutheran book and in the Anglican Communion rite.

We leave the reader to judge, also, of the method which takes

<sup>4</sup> We have seen that Canon Brightman gives a quotation from the *Antididagma* as the supposed source of "the offering of ourselves" in the Anglican Canon. If a German source must be sought, we suggest that a more likely one would be the following quotation from the *Pia Consultatio*:—"Moreover, through Christ we offer to God the Father both our souls and our bodies, an acceptable sacrifice through faith to the praise and glory of His name. To which St. Paul exhorts us in Romans 12. . . ." (p. cx). Later on we indicate a possible English source.

<sup>5</sup> We again repeat that the *Encheiridion* and the *Antididagma* were never translated into English.

three passages from different parts of the *Antididagma*, isolates them from their context, changes their order, alters their doctrinal significance, and then boldly proclaims them to be "sources" of the Anglican rite!

It may, however, be urged that Canon Brightman himself suggests an additional source for the words in question, namely, a quotation from the "King's Book" or "Necessary Doctrine," published under Henry VIII's auspices in 1543.

The quotation in question is the following: "Our Saviour Christ hath offered Himself upon the Cross a sufficient redemption and satisfaction for the sins of all the world," fol. d. ii.

We will not deny that this sentence may indeed have been in Cranmer's mind, or in the mind of whoever, under his auspices, wrote the "Canon" for the new Prayer Book, seeing that the "Necessary Doctrine" was signed by practically all the Henrician Bishops, including Cranmer himself. We will only urge that coming as it does in a context which has nothing to do with the Eucharist, it is not so likely a source as others which we will now indicate.

First we must prefix a remark which may seem strange and unwelcome to some people, and that is, that some of these Henrician formulae of faith are really not so orthodox as most people imagine. A careful reading of them reveals striking ambiguities of language which, in the opinion of the present writer, can only be interpreted as attempts to water down the orthodox and traditional Catholic doctrine in such a way as to prepare the way for an accommodation with the new Lutheran errors.

A striking instance of this is to be found in the conception of the Sacrifice of the Mass put forth by no less a person than Bishop Tunstall, in the answer to the German representatives which he<sup>6</sup> drew up on behalf of Henry VIII in 1538:

"You say that the sacrament of the Eucharist is not a sacrifice, because the one propitiatory sacrifice is the death of Christ, who dies no more, and was offered once for all for us, and that therefore there remains no further sacrifice but a spiritual sacrifice. . . . We wonder that anyone should be opposed to calling the Mass a sacrifice. . . . Therein is made a consecration of the body and blood of the Lord in memory of His death. . . . If Christ is both priest and sacrifice and victim, whosoever Christ is, there is our victim, there is our sacrifice. . . . Moreover, because Christ our sacrifice, who Himself dies no more, is in the Mass, and we also there, His body and members, offer ourselves with Him our Head to God as living sacrifices, the Greeks call the whole an unbloody sacrifice. . . . Moreover, when in the Mass both priest and people, repenting of their sins, as Paul exhorts, exhibit themselves a holy and living sacrifice,<sup>7</sup> sing praises to God and give thanks, who can doubt that for this reason also the Mass is rightly called a sacrifice? . . ."

<sup>6</sup> According to Kidd, *Later Mediæval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, p. 80, and Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, II, p. 5 note. The document is in Pocock's *Burnet*, IV, pp. 373-391.

<sup>7</sup> Why should not this be regarded as the "source" for the oblation of ourselves in the Anglican Canon?



The same document gives a very lame defence of the practice of saying private Masses.

A striking feature in the above "defence" of the sacrificial character of the Mass is the absence of any clear statement that in the Mass Christ is offered. There is a consecration of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, who offered Himself on the Cross and is therefore "our sacrifice." That is all. This letter of Tunstall's to the Germans was without any doubt known to Cranmer, who was president of the English representatives, and throughout a close friend of Tunstall's.<sup>8</sup>

We now pass on to the "Rationale," an explanation of prayers and ceremonies produced probably by a Commission which sat from about 1540 to 1543, but which was not then published. It seems to have been kept by Cranmer, for Convocation apparently asked for it at the beginning of the reign of Edward VI, and it may well have had some influence on the Prayer Book.

In this "Rationale,"<sup>9</sup> as in Tunstall's letter, no offering of Christ in the Mass is referred to, but only the commemoration of the passion (I italicize possible sources of the Anglican Canon):

"The minister the which shall celebrate, in the beginning cometh forth as from some secret place to the middle of the altar, signifying thereby that Christ who is the High Priest, came forth from the secret bosom of His Father into this world, to offer sacrifice for man's redemption, and albeit that *that sacrifice be a sufficient price and redemption for all the world*, yet it is not efficient or effectual but only to them which acknowledgeth themselves with penance to be sinners. . . .

"The Offertory, whereby we learn to prepare *ourselves* by God's grace to be an acceptable oblation to Him, to the intent we may be partakers of the blessed Sacrifice which Christ offered for us upon the cross. . . .

"The Canon. . . . The priest begins to represent in this sacrifice of the Mass the most painful and bloody sacrifice *once offered for our salvation upon the Cross*, and prays the Father to accept these gifts prepared for the consecration. . . ." (Cf. Collier, V, 110-117.)

Space forbids us to do more than remark that there is no reference to the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist in the Ten Articles, or in the Bishops' Book, and only an ambiguous reference in the King's Book. The latter does not call the Eucharist a "sacrifice," but a "memorial of the Redemption."

And lastly, we have the remarkable sermon preached by Bishop Gardiner before King Edward VI, on June 29th, 1548 (*i.e.*, during the First Prayer Book appeared). In this sermon he said:<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> "Tunstall of Durham, for whom during twenty years the Archbishop had the deepest friendship," Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and B.C.P.*, p. 29.

<sup>9</sup> Brightman says that the *Rationale* was influenced by the *Encheiridion* of Cologne, and gives a reference to the Alcuin edition of the former work. An examination however fails to reveal any borrowing. The Alcuin editor merely mentions the *Encheiridion* with other works in a footnote, as containing expositions of the rites of baptism.

<sup>10</sup> Taken from Dr. Darwell Stone, *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, II, p. 148. I italicize here also significant phrases.

"Christ was sent to be our Sacrifice. . . . He was the Bishop that offered for our sins, and the Sacrifice that was offered. . . . And like as His sacrifice then made was sufficient for us, to deliver us from our sins . . . so, to continue us in the same favour of God, He ordained a *perpetual remembrance* of Himself. . . . Not for another redemption, as though the first had not been sufficient, nor as though the world needed a new redemption from sin, but that we might thoroughly remember His passion. . . . And this daily sacrifice He instituted to be continued among Christian men, not for need of another *redemption or satisfaction for the sins of the world* (for that was sufficiently performed by His sacrifice of His body and blood, done upon the Cross), neither that He be now our bishop for need of any further sacrifice to be made for sin, but to continue us in the remembrance of His passion suffered for us. . . . And this is the true understanding of the Mass, not for another redemption, but that we may be strong in believing the benefit of Christ's death and bloodshedding for us upon the Cross. . . ."

It must be remembered that this sermon was preached to order, and that Gardiner may well have endeavoured to adapt his discourse to his hearers. He also doubtless knew that he was threatened with imprisonment, and indeed, with all his care, he failed to satisfy his hearers, and on the following day, June 30th, he was committed to the Tower by the Council.

When in prison, Gardiner wrote a much more orthodox explanation and defence of the Mass, in reply to Cranmer's treatise of 1550. In this work he not only defends Catholic doctrine, especially concerning the Real Presence, but endeavours to justify it by the language of the First Prayer Book. It is noteworthy that while defending the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the real offering of Christ's Body and Blood therein, he himself paraphrases the preamble to the Consecration in the Prayer Book in such a way as to show that taken in itself its positive statement was of course true:

"The oblation and sacrifice of our Saviour Christ was and is a perfect work, once consummate in perfection without necessity of reiteration, as it was never taught to be reiterate, but a mere blasphemy to suppose it. It is also in the Catholic teaching . . . agreed that the same sacrifice once consummate was ordained by Christ's institution in His most holy Supper to be often remembered and showed forth in such sort of showing as to the faithful is seen present the most precious body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ under the forms of bread and wine . . . acknowledging the same precious body and blood to be the sacrifice propitiatory for all the sins of the world, whereunto they only resort and only account that their very perfect oblation and sacrifice of Christian people, through which all other sacrifices necessary on our part be accepted and pleasant in the sight of God. . . . The Catholic doctrine teacheth not the daily sacrifice of Christ's most blessed body and blood to be an iteration of the once perfected sacrifice on the Cross, but a sacrifice that representeth that sacrifice, and sheweth it also before the faithful eyes, and refresheth the effectual memory of it, so as in the daily sacrifice, without shedding of blood, we may see with the eye of faith the very body and blood of Christ by God's mighty power . . . distinctly exhibited . . . which is a lively memorial to stir up our faith."

All this is somewhat Cranmerian, though Gardiner already says that the Mass is "*a sacrifice which represents a sacrifice*," which Cranmer would hardly have said. In any case Gardiner goes on to add:

"The Catholic doctrine teaching the daily sacrifice to be the same in

essence that was offered on the Cross once. . . . The offering on the Cross was, and is, propitiatory and satisfactory for our redemption and remission of sins. . . . *The daily offering is propitiatory also*, but not in that degree of propitiation as for redemption . . . which was once purchased . . . but for . . . the mitigation of God's displeasure . . . etc."<sup>11</sup>

Here at any rate we have a statement that there is an offering of Christ in the Mass, a statement which was absent from the other writers.

Summing up, in our opinion, the language of the First Prayer Book Canon is derived, not from the *Encheiridion* or the *Antididagma*, but from the Lutheran "*Pia Consultatio*" and from certain English productions. With diabolical ingenuity and heretical intent, Cranmer and his assistants took these over-moderate statements put forward by Tunstall and Gardiner on the Catholic side, and by over-emphasizing certain phrases, and omitting others, insinuated an inference—the denial of any real sacrifice in the Mass—from which, when pressed, these two Catholic bishops doubtless would both have recoiled.

That Cranmer indeed intended to deny any real sacrifice or offering of Christ in the Eucharist can be easily shown, both from his published writings, and from an examination of the Communion rite as a whole. As to his published works, even Mr. Jalland agrees that "within three years of the accession of Edward VI" Cranmer denied that the sacrifice of the Mass is a sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ (*This our Sacrifice*, p. 119). Dr. Darwell Stone also admits this:

"By the year 1550, or possibly earlier, Cranmer had reached the position maintained in his *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine*. . . . He denies Transubstantiation both in its more carnal and in its spiritual form . . . and he repudiates any sacrifice of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist" (op. cit., II, 127; italics ours).

Moreover, if space permitted, we could go on to show in detail that no less than sixteen expressions found in the Sarum Mass implying the doctrine of the real sacrifice were either altered or omitted altogether from the rite in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.<sup>12</sup> *There is no offering of Christ's Body and Blood*: there is only a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and an "oblation of ourselves." Dr. Srawley himself admits that "in the Prayer for the Church the old language was freely adapted and paraphrased, and all words suggestive of 'oblation' and 'sacrifice' were omitted" (*Liturgy and Worship*, 1932, p. 323). The Epistle to the Hebrews argues that a change in the priesthood and a change in the law of sacrifice go together (Hebrews vii. 12). The Catholic priesthood is ordained to offer the Body and Blood of Our Lord in the Mass. The Anglican ministry is

<sup>11</sup> Apud Darwell Stone, op. cit. II, p. 150 *et seq.*

<sup>12</sup> Still more drastic changes were, of course, made in the Second Prayer Book, and have remained till our own time.

not ordained for any such act. The Anglican rites of Ordination and Communion surely make this perfectly clear.

ADDENDUM.

If there were any doubt as to the un-Catholic nature of the "sacrifice" as taught in the Anglican Canon, it is removed by the fact that Bucer, in his *Censura* on the First Prayer Book, had no criticism to offer of the phraseology used there. He criticized many other features of the service and its rubrics, on the ground that they favoured "Popish" doctrine, but he nowhere objected that the Anglican Communion Service claims to be a sacrifice of Christ's body and blood. He would most certainly have criticized such a doctrine had it been either stated or implied. This is, in itself, a sufficient proof that there is no such sacrifice taught or implied in the Anglican rite.

## HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. BERNARD PATTEN, D.D., L.S.S.

*First Sunday of Advent.*

Gospel. Luke xxi. 25-33.

We are often reminded that those who hear our sermons live in a world very empty of dogma, sharing life and thought with people who receive no higher Christmas message than that conveyed by a card, or by a gift—or, at best, by a Nativity play of poor dogmatic content. Discount the danger as you will, the truth remains that our Advent sermons should always stress the fundamental dogma that the Babe of Bethlehem was really and truly the Son of God.

Today's gospel presents the Divine Babe as the Judge of all mankind: "They shall see the Son of Man coming in a cloud, with great power and majesty." He comes to judge; this Second Coming, the *Parousia* or solemn official visit of Christ the King, is connected in time and cause with His exercise of judicial power. The Church combines the two in one article of the Creed, and we may take as our text the Nicene formula: *et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos*.

*Et iterum venturus est.* The fact of the Second Coming is a matter of Faith; the time is the secret of God. All we know is that a world-catastrophe and other signs will herald the Advent of the King. True, many early Christians thought the time imminent, but the end was not yet. Christ and His Apostles assigned no date; He knew it, of course, but it was no part of His Messianic office to reveal it, and thus He could say, "of that day or hour no man knoweth, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father" (Mark xiii. 32).

*Venturus est cum gloria.* The Second Coming offers a contrast. He Who emptied Himself now shows forth His divine power. Then a child in swaddling-clothes, now a King in the raiment of God. The Prisoner before Caiaphas had foretold this Coming as the great manifestation of His Divinity. "Art thou the Christ the Son of the blessed God? And Jesus said to him: I am. And you shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of the power of God, and coming with the clouds of heaven" (Mark xiv. 61). Now that day has come; it is pre-eminently the "Day of the Lord," one day of all eternity that does justice to the Word Who was in the bosom of the Father before time began. Now atonement is made for what He suffered in making atonement for us, for now His enemies are under His feet and He "has come to be glorified in His saints and to be made wonderful in all them that have believed"



(2 Thess. i. 10). All flesh now beholds the glory of Christ the Son of the Living God. The Galilean has conquered.

*Iudicare vivos et mortuos.* Christ comes as Judge of all mankind. This supreme judicial power, reserved to God in the Old Testament, appears in the Gospels as a prerogative of the Messiah. Christ as God has this power *iure suo*; as Man He enjoys it *quasi ex commissione Dei* (Suarez). "Neither doth the Father judge any man, but hath given all judgment to the Son . . . and He hath given Him power to do judgment because He is the Son of Man" (John v. 22, 27). That He would exercise that power on the Last Day Christ asserted more than once: "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and then will He render to every man according to his works" (Matt. xvi. 27). Indeed, one could regard His First Coming as a judgment: the Child Who was set for the fall and for the resurrection of many in Israel came with fan in hand to separate the wheat from the chaff; for judgment—the judgment of *discernment*—did He come into the world. But only at His Second Coming will He use His full judicial power; His First Coming was to save (John iii. 17).

We may conclude with the next phrase of the Nicene Creed, "*cuius regni non erit finis.*" The Second Coming will inaugurate the Kingdom of God; it will be a "regeneration" (Matt. xix. 28), a redemption (Luke xxi. 28), the complete redemption of the Mystical Body of Christ. We are heirs to that Kingdom which shall have no end. Let us learn from the First Coming to prepare for the Second. And as we await the feast of Christmas, let us try to learn the lesson that "the grace of God our Saviour hath appeared to all men, instructing us, that, denying ungodliness and worldly desires, we should live soberly and justly and godly in this world, looking for the blessed hope and coming of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Tit. ii. 11-13).

### *Second Sunday of Advent.*

*Gospel.* Matt. xi. 2-10.

The second, third, and fourth Sundays of Advent have Gospels dealing with St. John the Baptist. The life of the great Forerunner is, of course, a rich quarry for the preacher (his humility, his mortification, his martyrdom for the sanctity of marriage, to mention but a few), but during this Advent we must use the Gospel-story to emphasize the Divinity of Jesus Christ. The account of the Baptist's embassy gives an excellent opportunity; the text "the blind see, the lame walk, etc." immediately suggests a consideration of Christ's miracles as proof that He was God.

The context is instructive. With devoted loyalty to their master, commendable in itself, the disciples of John saw rivalry where there was none and resented the growing influence of Jesus.

That some of their own had gone over to Him was hard to bear, all the harder since it seemed to them that the new Preacher owed much to John's sponsorship. And now, while John is in prison, his "rival" is gaining a national reputation and has just performed (Cf. St. Luke's order) the stupendous miracle (and "John indeed did no sign"—John x. 41) of raising to life a widow's son at Naim. And John, their master, seems quite undismayed at the loss of fame, disciples and "congregation"!

To set them right, to make them understand, John sends two of them to Jesus. Outspoken witness to the greater dignity of Christ (John iii. 27-31) had not been enough; they could not understand why their master should decrease. Now they come and lo! the miracles of Christ appear before their eyes. John has called Him Isaias' Lamb of God: His miracles proclaim Him Isaias' Servant of God, endowed with Divine power. Yes, at the word of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the promised Messiah, "the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again." (Cf. Isaias xxxv. 5-6, lxi. 1-2) Art thou the Messiah? Yes, I am; My works prove it. And again to the Jews: "the works themselves which I do give testimony of Me, that the Father hath sent Me" (John v. 37). "If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not. But if I do, though you will not believe *Me*, believe the *works*: that you may know and believe that the Father is in Me, and I in the Father" (John x. 37-38).

The appeal to His works is clear, and the value of that appeal remains unchanged. Miracles are the language of God. Now, unless we admit the impossible conclusion that the God of Truth would use His own language to confirm error, we must concede that a miracle performed to prove a claim puts the truth of that claim beyond question. It is God's guarantee.

The application of this argument to Christ's miracles encounters one or two indirect difficulties. If Our Lord worked miracles to prove that He was God, why did He at times seek to prevent their publication? We reply that in some cases He enjoined silence rather than increase the hostility of His enemies, and that in general He wished to avoid such scenes or demonstrations as might encourage the false Jewish longing for a "Kingdom of this world." Another difficulty, frequently proposed, is based on the text "unless you see signs and wonders, you believe not" (John iv. 48), it being suggested that Our Lord disdained the evidence of His works. However, the context makes it abundantly clear that He merely contrasted the incredulity of the Jews with the more perfect dispositions of the Samaritans who had "believed in Him because of His own word" (John iv. 41).

Our Lord's miracles not only prove the *fact* of the Incarnation; they also illustrate its *purpose*. Parables in action, they too have their counterpart in revealed truths. Every withered hand made whole points to Christ the great Restorer; every darkened eye opened to the light reveals Him as the Light of the World; every

leprous body cleansed of its defilement proclaims Him the Redeemer Who takes away sin. And His full power as Author and Lord of life is made manifest when from death-chamber and bier and sepulchre He takes booty from all-conquering Death. He is God with us, mighty in word and work. His miracles show Him as the Second Adam come to save the world from the sin and suffering and death that came with the first Adam's fall; He has come to crush the serpent's head, to cast out the prince of this world: "for this purpose the Son of God appeared, that He might destroy the works of the devil" (I John iii. 8). And blessed are they who are not scandalized in Him, who do not find His miracles a stumbling-block, but rather accept them as Heaven's guarantee that Christ was God.

*Third Sunday of Advent.*

*Gospel. John i. 19-28.*

The false Jewish ideas of the Messiah, born of a misunderstanding of Messianic prophecy, furnish a good example of how without the aid of an authoritative interpreter of Sacred Scripture the unstable may wrest it to their own destruction. The Old Testament, read aright, gives the picture of a Messiah at once a Warrior-King and a Prince of Peace, a King of Glory and a Man of Sorrows, but by the average Jew of the time of Our Lord (we know it both from the Gospels and from the non-biblical literature of the century before) the Messiah was expected almost exclusively as a mighty champion who would make a spectacular appearance, cast off the Roman yoke, and establish in power a world-Kingdom of Israel. The contrast between this and the true Messianic programme appears nowhere more effectively than in the Gospel-story of Our Lord's "temptation" in the desert; and if Satan stands forth as the advocate of the Jewish ideal, it only shows how imperfectly the Chosen People now understood the Promise. No wonder, then, that Christ was rejected; no wonder that they rejected Him Whose kingdom was not of this world, Who appeared as King of the Jews only on the Cross.

*There hath stood one in the midst of you, whom you know not.* As addressed by John the Baptist to the "ecclesiastical Commission" sent to examine his credentials as a preacher, the words may not contain a reproach because Jesus had not yet been made manifest to all as the fulfilment of prophecy. But after His Public Life, the attitude of the Jews is inexcusable. Only self-caused blindness and hardness of heart rejected the miracles and realization of prophecy offered as proof by Jesus of Nazareth, Who, born in Bethlehem of the house of David, came among the people, heralded by an Elias in spirit, and went about through Palestine, the Angel of the Testament, preaching good tidings to the poor, taking away man's sorrow and suffering, and finally, as the Lamb of God, taking away the sin of the world. There may be pleas of ignorance, passion, or prejudice, but the final verdict must be one of condemnation.

Such a verdict we find in the twelfth chapter of St. John's Gospel, which describes with dramatic variety and with forcible comments how Christ was received. The love and devotion of Mary of Bethany (1-8) is set over against the hostility of the chief priests (10-11). The enthusiasm of the people on Palm Sunday (12-18) seems to contrast with the jealousy of the Pharisees (19), but since their *Hosanna* is soon to change to *Crucifige* we know that the real contrast lies between them and the Gentiles (20-21) who so earnestly desired to see Jesus. And, indeed, notwithstanding the voice from heaven come for their sakes (28-30), the faith of the Jews cannot overcome the scandal of the Cross (32-34). *That* had no place in *their* interpretation of the prophets. St. John pronounces judgment (37-41) on their unbelief; theirs was the culpable blindness foretold and denounced by Isaiah (vi. 9-10). And he adds the judgment of Christ: "I am come, a light into the world, that whosoever believeth in Me may not remain in darkness. . . . He that despiseth Me and receiveth not My words hath One that judgeth him. The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (John xii. 46, 48).

Many to-day reject Christ, and many reject the Church which He founded. But she continues to urge her claims; she too has her miracles, she too is the fulfilment of prophecy. She too must contend with ignorance and passion and prejudice, and false interpretation of God's Word, and false philosophies, and false ideas of what is good for man. She suffers persecution, she is hated without cause, she is despised and rejected. She is not of the world, she will not accommodate her teaching to the wishes of the world, and the world hates her. But she remembers that it hath hated *Him* before her, and knowing that He is ever with her she can "rejoice always." She can rejoice in Him Who has overcome the world.

#### *Fourth Sunday of Advent.*

*Gospel.* Luke iii. 1-6.

Some seven hundred years before the time of Our Lord the prophet Isaiah foretold that Cyrus would deliver the Jews from the Babylonian Captivity and that Christ would deliver the human race from the bondage of sin. The two returns from captivity are not unrelated, and in the manner of Hebrew prophecy Isaiah describes one in terms of the other. Thus, to describe the work of John the Baptist preparing the way for Christ the King, the prophet borrows his imagery from his picture of the glad home-coming of the Jews: Yahweh their King leads them back, and for the royal cortège the desert-roads must be fittingly prepared; holes must be filled in and all obstacles removed. "Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low."

For both restorations, the one by Cyrus, the other by Christ,

there was necessary a preparation of heart. Even as Isaias asked the Jews to be converted that they might be consoled, so did John the Baptist preach the necessity of penance to prepare for the Kingdom of Heaven. He preached penance, a change of mind. He urged certain social and religious reforms (Cf. Luke iii. 7-14). His plea for the observance of justice and charity is striking: it recalls the teaching of Isaias to the captive Jews and anticipates our modern Catholic ideals as expressed in the Encyclicals of Pope Pius XI.

It is a far cry from our twentieth century to the Babylonian Captivity of the sixth century B.C., but the condition of our modern world strangely resembles the condition of the Jewish exiles whom Isaias prophetically addressed. They sorely needed glad tidings as they wept by the waters of Babylon. The Holy City had been destroyed and Jeremias had chanted her dirge. From the daughter of Sion all her beauty had departed; the city, once full of people, now sat solitary; the mistress of the Gentiles had become as a widow; the prince of the provinces had been made tributary. Jerusalem was in grievous exile because Jerusalem had grievously sinned. She had worshipped false gods; she had followed false leaders; she had given ear to false prophets who cried "Peace, peace!" when there was no peace; she had admitted an economic system that allowed the oppression of the widow and the orphan; she had outraged the sanctity of marriage. Her sins had cried to heaven for vengeance and the "Day of the Lord" had come.

The parallel in our day is indeed striking. Our world has worshipped false gods and now realizes that they are powerless to save. Our world has reared an economic structure on sand, and we have suffered the rain and the storm and the flood. Our generation has based her social and international relations on class-consciousness and self-seeking, and we reap what hate planted and envy watered. Our generation has given ear to false prophets who cried "Peace, peace," when there was no peace; she now has war and rumours of war. Our world has given willing ear to charlatan moralists; she is left with homes broken or childless. Everywhere to-day there is doubt, disappointment, defeatism, disillusionment, despair.

"Consolamini, consolamini, popule meus!" These words of Isaias are the words of our Holy Father. His message is a Christmas message: "Seek the Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ." The world needs a change of heart and the Encyclicals point the way. To avert the pestilence of irreligion, they prescribe a return to God and to the things of God, a return to Christian life and to Christian institutions. To class at war with class, to nation contending with nation, they speak of justice and charity. As an antidote to naturalism in thought, materialism in philosophy, and utilitarianism in ethics, there comes an Encyclical expounding the true nature, importance and excellence of Christian Education, and boldly asserting in the teeth of violent opposition the inalienable rights of the family and of



the Church. And finally, for indeed we cannot mention all, the Encyclical on Christian Marriage comes as a much-needed lesson to our modern world. The teaching of Jesus Christ is repeated and explained; the rights of the Church are clearly set forth; and, perhaps most welcome of all, there comes an emphatic condemnation of modern abuses with a scathing exposure of the fallacies of that peculiar class of moralists who strain out a gnat and swallow a camel.

We are within two days of Christmas. The Catholic Church has a message for all men. The Babe of Bethlehem is Christ, the Son of the Living God, and He alone can bring peace to the world.

*Sunday within the Octave of Christmas.*

*Gospel. Luke ii. 33-40.*

In the Temple of Jerusalem a just and devout Jew named Simeon holds in his arms the Divine Babe of Bethlehem, blesses God, and speaks the *Nunc Dimittis*. Here from St. Luke, painter at least in words, we have a miniature of the picture of the Christ of Prophecy which covers the entire canvas of St. Matthew's Gospel.

Well might Simeon rejoice, for his eyes have seen the Saviour Whom many prophets and just men had desired to see. The promise of God has been fulfilled. The Lord has come to the Temple as the glory of His people Israel. The sceptre has passed from Juda, but He to Whom it belongs has come: in Bethlehem the city of David He has been born King of the Jews; His power is an everlasting power that shall not be taken away; the throne of David is His, and He shall reign in the house of Jacob for ever. Simeon must now recall the words of Isaias: "A Child is born to us and a Son is given to us, and the government is upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace. His empire shall be multiplied, and there shall be no end of peace. He shall sit upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to establish it and strengthen it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth and for ever" (Is. x. 6-7).

To some it was given to recognize at once in Mary's Child the Incarnate Word of God. Angel voices spoke the glad tidings to the shepherds and now the Spirit of God makes revelation to Simeon—and to Anna. (It is strange that with many preachers Anna is a Cinderella among the women of the Gospel. Surely there is a lesson to be learned from the rich reward here given for a long and faithful service of God. There is an Anna in almost every parish, one to whose early happy life came a lonely widowhood, and who now lives only for God and for His Church, often in the church, scarcely "departing from the Temple" but "by fastings and prayers serving night and day." To such the story of Anna affords consolation and encouragement.)

Simeon and Anna profess their faith in the Lord's Anointed.

Here we see an early indication of the great "outpouring of the Spirit" which was characteristic of the Infant Church after Pentecost. It was the fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel (quoted by St. Peter in his first discourse—Acts ii. 17): "It shall come to pass in the last days (saith the Lord), I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy: and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams." The vision given to Simeon passes beyond the mental horizon of a Jew, for Christ is not only "the glory of Israel"; He is also "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles." And it clashes with the Jewish expectation, for Christ is seen as a sign that men will question, as a standard which some will loyally follow and others shamefully desert.

Those who follow Christ must be prepared to suffer. "If any man will follow Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross" (Mark viii. 34). It is fitting that Simeon should now predict the martyrdom of Mary, for the Queen of Martyrs must walk at the head of the followers of Christ. And this is Her First Dolour, the first wave of that immeasurable sea of sorrow that broke in upon Her soul when She stood beneath the Cross.

Perhaps this is the most profitable thought we can carry away from to-day's Gospel, while we review the past year and wonder what the New Year will bring. If it brings tribulation, we must remember that suffering is the badge of Christ's followers. If we suffer with patience we prove ourselves worthy children of God; "if we suffer, we shall also reign with Him" (2 Tim. ii. 12). Use does not stale, nor familiarity lessen, the truth of Christ's words, "Blessed are ye who weep now, for you shall rejoice." Rejoice, therefore, "being partakers of the sufferings of Christ, that when His joy shall be revealed you may also be glad with exceeding joy" (I Peter iv. 13), for our present tribulation, which is momentary and light, "worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory" (II Cor. iv. 17).

## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### I. MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW.

BY THE REV. E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.

As a commemoration of the second centenary of the institution of the Redemptorists, Marc's well-known manual has been re-edited. Like so many of its fellows, among the manuals of Moral Theology, it now has a triple authorship, namely, Marc-Gestermann-Raus.<sup>1</sup> Its latest redactor, the author of a commentary on the Code and other theological works, is eminently fitted for the task of keeping Marc up to date with recent decisions of the Holy See and the opinions of modern authors. The only drawback, an unavoidable one in all such recensions, is that the reader is never sure whether the doctrine is that of Marc, Gestermann, or Raus. The parts which have been most transformed are those dealing with conscience, imperfection, sexual knowledge, taxation, and lying. The Sacraments are in Volume II which has not yet appeared. Those priests who have been, as it were, brought up on Marc, will find in the new edition everything which endeared them to the old and, in addition, a very thorough acquaintance with modern problems and recent writers such as Merkelbach. The matter is clearly arranged and more than adequate for a two volume Manual. In a text book dealing with so many subjects the solutions of controverted issues cannot always meet with universal approval, but in no case is an opinion given which is unwarranted by the teaching of other theologians of repute. We think that Fr. Slater, S.J., whose books still have a considerable influence amongst English-speaking priests, should have been included amongst the theologians in the brief history of Moral Theology. As it is outlined, England has been left out of the League of Nations altogether in the section dealing with authors. When this valuable manual is completed by the second volume we shall be able to give a fuller appreciation of the work.

The new edition of Dr. Linneborn's study of the Marriage Laws,<sup>2</sup> though written primarily for German readers, will also be much used in other parts of the Church. For its author has the advantage of being the "Officialis" of Paderborn, and the work has all the signs of practical experience in the working of the law, which some of the treatises lack. Inspired by *Casti Connubii*, which is printed in *extenso*, the book meets the needs

<sup>1</sup> *Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae*, Vol. I, 19th ed. Paris, 1933; xvi-890 pages. 40 francs.

<sup>2</sup> *Grundriss des Eherechts*, Verlag Ferdinand Schoniningh, Paderborn. 10 marks; 500 pages.

of beginners and also of more advanced students. Controversies and minor points of interpretation are dealt with in ample footnotes, leaving the text free from encumbrances. For example, the footnote to page 58 gives a most ample bibliography on the question of the *Sterile Period*. Both on this matter and on some other points, such as the non-sacramental character of marriage between a baptized and a non-baptized person, a fuller statement of the author's own mind would have been welcome. But, as an explanation of the marriage laws operative in Germany, the work is of the greatest value, for the civil law is rightly kept well to the fore and explained; we are given, also, the text of the directions issued to the clergy by the Bishops at Fulda in 1931, and many other indications of the position in Germany, at the moment, of the institution of marriage.

Our own country, but far less so than Germany, continues to be agitated by a few extremists who demand increased facilities for divorce. A Bill will be introduced again into Parliament this session enlarging the grounds of petition to include desertion for three years, insanity and drunkenness; there appears to be no reason to suppose that it will be more successful than last year's attempt.

Both those who are with us and those who are against us are suffering, nowadays, from a multitude of organizations. There has just appeared the fifth issue of a collection of papers from members of the "International Medical Group for the Investigation of Contraception." The papers are published under the auspices of the "Birth Control Investigation Committee" which is now a part of the "National Birth Control Association," and they are introduced by Dr. Blacker. It contains a number of statistical charts and several samples of the "history cards" of individuals attending clinics. The statistics must be taken with all the reservations necessary, owing to the very limited area of examination. It is stated that in one Maternal Health Centre in America 574 out of the 2,000 patients were Catholics, which does not mean that they were seeking advice on contraception; for it is shown that Catholic women had the largest number of pregnancies and Jews the lowest. On the other hand, the smallest number of therapeutic abortions is in the Catholic group and the largest in the Jewish. Though limited in scope, it is an instructive comparison, for we have always understood that Jews are opposed to Birth Control. One other point is of interest—a method of contraception which, to the present writer at least, is quite new. Dr. Baskin of Colorado has claimed that, from experiments made by him, it is possible to immunize women with human spermatazoa and the immunization lasts about a year when re-vaccination becomes necessary. *Quis talia fando* . . .

That Jewish fertility is particularly low, in spite of Jewish

<sup>3</sup> *National Birth Control Association*, 26, Eccleston Street, London, S.W.1. 95 pages. 2s.

ethical teaching on the subject, is also noted by Dr. Enid Charles,<sup>4</sup> who supplies many statistics based on the Kuczynski method. If one may detect a thesis running through the book it is to underline the menace of under-population. That there is no danger of food shortage is shown by a number of examples. Dr. Charles, and some others who have been misled by one of Dr. Stopes' favourite points, speaks of "coitus reservatus," as though it were a commonplace amongst Catholic authorities writing on the subject. When it is brought to their notice they are usually at a loss to know what exactly is meant by it; once it is explained, it is evident to anyone who has the most elementary knowledge of Catholic teaching that it is prohibited because in the generality of cases it is really indistinguishable from "coitus interruptus." Of greater interest is the view recorded both by Dr. Charles and by a writer in the "International Medical Group" concerning the Sterile Period. "It is not yet sufficiently established to be relied upon as a contraceptive measure. The irregularity of the menstrual cycle, the many deviations from the normal, and the fact that conception is known to have occurred during practically every part of the month, should lead to great caution in accepting the 'safe period' as a practical method."<sup>5</sup> Dr. Charles agrees that the seven days immediately preceding menstruation constitutes a period during which the probability of conception is at a minimum; it is also reasonably certain that the belief in the efficacy of restricting intercourse to the middle week, or the middle fortnight of the month, as a means of avoiding conception, is undoubtedly wrong. But "as far as human beings are concerned there is no positive evidence pointing to the existence of a safe period."<sup>6</sup> Such measured statements by these authorities are in marked contrast to the very confident assertions made in certain quarters by Catholic writers who, inadvisedly and unjustifiably we think, are preaching the "sterile period" in season and out of season.

The latest addition to the literature on this subject is a treatise in English by Dr. Ogino, who with Dr. Knaus of Austria first worked out the new computation.<sup>7</sup> It is quite a small book and is, naturally, concerned only with the medical side of the question. It gives, in a more or less popular form, the reasons which have led the authorities to their conclusions, and has an ample supply of charts. The publishers claim that it explains fully this "new" law of Nature, but they do not point out that the term is not the equivalent of the ethicist's "Natural Law" which regulates human conduct. The moral problem is entirely concerned with the lawfulness of using the Sterile Period

<sup>4</sup> *The Twilight of Parenthood*. Watts & Co. 226 pages.

<sup>5</sup> *International Medical Group*, page 18.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, page 167.

<sup>7</sup> *Conception Period of Women*, by Dr. K. Ogino, M.D. Medical Arts Publishing Company, Harrisburg, Pa., U.S.A. 2 dollars.



exclusively, and we are not directly concerned with the reliability of the guidance offered by the medical authorities. This must remain, for many years, a matter of dispute, until it is tested by a wide experience, and the confessor will wisely refrain from usurping the office of a gynæcologist. Whilst there is not yet any explicit guidance from the Holy See, our theologians are examining the problem in the light of established principles, and we may quote two recent writers who, happily, are in complete agreement on the fundamental issues.

In the current *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, Fr. J. Salsmans, S.J., who is well known as the "continuator" of Génicot's Manual, contributes a careful study entitled "*Sterilitas Facultativa Licita?*": "*Quae in sensum severum scripsimus, non impediunt quominus privatim, in tribunali poenitentiae, confessorius prudenter et 'caute insinuet' continentiam periodicam, vel tanquam minus malum onanistis secus obstinatis, vel tanquam inculpabilem iis conjugibus qui ad hanc grave motivum habeant, imposito silentio quantum fieri possit. Sicque imitabitur prudentiam S.Poenitentiariae 16 Junii 1880. . . . Non omnis veritas utiliter coram omnibus praedicatur. Neque improbamus medicum catholicum qui continentiam periodicam tanquam licitam prudenter insinuat iis conjugibus qui ad hanc habeant rationem sufficientem. Sed, ut optime scribit R. P. Heymeijer, nec medicum nec sacerdotem decet zelo zelare pro methodo Ogini-Knaus.*" He concludes against the lawfulness of promulgating and broadcasting the new information, particularly by the clergy, who should always show themselves opposed to the use of the sterile period, as a general rule, unless in a particular instance strong reasons are present to justify it. Dr. Louis Nau in *The Acolythe* for August 18th teaches practically the same doctrine. "All prominent Catholic moralists vehemently condemn the broadcasting and general dissemination of the practice. . . . To establish the sterile period demands the advice of experts. A priest assuming to give such practical advice is trespassing on a field that does not belong to him. Venturing upon such an intimate personal discussion, ill becomes an Ambassador of Christ. It is derogatory to the dignity of the priesthood. Failure in the outcome will destroy the confidence of penitents so much needed for the exercise of the sacred ministry. A priest consulted will answer the moral difficulty, but for the *régime* to be followed he will remit the party to a reputable and competent physician. A confessor has no right to brand the practice of 'Rhythm' as sinful, but, if he is true to his duties, he will follow the instruction of the Sacred Penitentiary (*caute insinuari*) and advise the practice only in particular cases where there are serious reasons such as sickness, poverty, very difficult childbirth caused by malformations, and other like physiological or psychological reasons."

In the course of his argument Fr. Salsmans maintains the view that the practice is "*per se illicita et non nisi bona ratione cohonestanda*," a statement explained more fully in a footnote

in which the author says: "Malumus ergo dicere electionem voluntatis quae imbibitur in continentia periodica (ac proin ipsum systema) esse per se illicitam, per accidens autem licitam, quando scil. (ut proprium est iis actibus qui cum fine primario habent et fines secundarios) inordinatio in respuendo fine primario compensatur rationabiliter sufficiente et cohonestante motivo accedente." As is the case with every "practical" question, its ultimate solution depends on a highly involved "theoretical" piece of reasoning. Fr. Salsmans is not dealing, in this text, with ethical theory *ex professo*, and it is not too easy to follow his argument. There still remains a vast amount of work to be done in this sphere.

Dom Lottin, O.S.B. is well known for his studies elucidating the idea of the "Natural Law" in the writings of St. Thomas, and in *Révue Thomiste* (July-October, 1934) he returns to his subject, "Le Problème de la moralité intrinsèque d'Abélard à St. Thomas." He examines the pre-Thomist scholastics, demonstrating how the accepted notion of "bonum ex objecto" was very gradually clarified by them, particularly by the Chancellor Philip. The following text from St. Thomas' *De Malo* finally closed, in a magisterial way, a century of groping for a suitable formula: "Actus moralis recipit speciem ab objecto secundum quod comparatur ad rationem. Et ideo dicitur communiter quod actus quidam sunt boni vel mali ex genere, et quod actus bonus ex genere est *actus cadens super debitam materiam*, sicut pascere esurientem; actus autem malus ex genere est qui cadit super indebitam materiam, sicut subtrahere aliena: materia enim actus dicitur objectum ipsius." The phrase "actus coniunctus cum debita materia" are the words of Philip who arrived at this formula by an ingenious application of the theory of "matter and form."

In an address delivered to the Scottish Law Agents' Society on October 5th, at Edinburgh, Lord Macmillan took as his subject *Law and History*, demonstrating amongst other things the necessity of historical study of the civil law for the purpose of understanding correctly the law as operative to-day. The same is true of Canon Law. In *Bishops and Reform*, by Marion Gibbs and Jane Lang,<sup>8</sup> the story of the influence of papal power in England, during the Middle Ages, is carried forward to the reign of Henry III. The method of election to bishoprics is discussed and the extent to which the decrees of the Lateran Council, 1215, were operative in England is indicated. In elections the final decision always lay with the sovereign Pontiff, and the Bishops took those enactments of the Council which were relevant to English conditions and issued them as diocesan constitutions in their own synods.

After a long slumber—the first fascicule appeared in 1924—*Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique*<sup>9</sup> is now appearing with reasonable speed under the able direction of Dr. Naz of the University

<sup>8</sup> Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d.

<sup>9</sup> Fasc. V and VI. Letouzey, Paris, 1934.

of Lille. Unlike the earlier fascicules, which were largely the work of one or two writers, we have now a distinguished group of collaborators, including such canonists as Fr. Creusen, S.J., of Louvain, Fr. Bastien, O.S.B., of St. Anselmo, Rome, and Mgr. Claeys-Bouaert, the Vicar General of Ghent. The work has now reached the word "Avocat." Amongst many interesting articles in the last fascicule we may mention that by Dr. Bayard on "Autel" as being typical of the way the various subjects are being treated. It is twelve columns in length and deals successively with the following points: (i.) Definition and kinds; (ii.) Laws governing its use; (iii.) Consecration; (iv.) Practical questions; (v.) Benefice. Speaking of the canopy and altar frontal, the absolute necessity of which has been rather stressed by some recent writers in England, the author forms the correct and sober judgment: "... ces exigences n'ont certainement plus leur caractère impérieux; mais si on peut avoir l'un et l'autre objet, il est mieux de les employer; ces sont des marques de respect, et on ne gagne rien à négliger la 'tenue' réglementaire de l'autel." The trouble with the modern altar is the fixed throne for Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, which has gradually turned the altar into a series of ledges leading up to it. This will, no doubt, be discussed in some subsequent article. In the meanwhile, we hope that the *Dictionnaire* will continue to grow quickly from its retarded infancy to the full stature of its many brothers.

The "Missa Dialogata" which, more than once, has called for discussion in this REVIEW, is amply dealt with by Dom Gaspar Lefébvre, O.S.B., in a volume containing the Conferences given during the Liturgical Week at Louvain in 1933.<sup>10</sup> He outlines the origin of the practice in modern times and shows that it is a most desirable and most liturgical method of assisting at Mass. His clear and interesting exposition of this subject, as well as the other contributions in the volume, makes this book eminently worthy of translation into English; we have not too much popular liturgical literature of the right sort, and the movement is on the increase amongst us. It is not, strictly speaking, a matter which can rightly be discussed under the heading of Moral and Canon Law, in spite of our subject being always in the nature of a "portmanteau." But Dom Lefébvre's succinct conclusions interpret the law of August 4th, 1922, so wisely that they are worth noting. The *minimum* in the "Missa Dialogata" is for the people to answer the responses assigned to the server at Low Mass; the Ordinary's assent is required, which may be implied from his known wishes or may be contained in a diocesan instruction, as that for the Malines Province, November 16th, 1922. The *maximum* is for the people to recite, in addition, *Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus Dei, Domine non sum dignus*; it is lawful if tolerated in any par-

<sup>10</sup> *La Participation Active Des Fidèles au Culte*. Semaines Liturgiques. Tome XI. Abbaye du Mont Cesar, 1933. 15 fr. 282 pages.

ticular diocese, and if there are no official directions it may be allowed exactly as the *minimum* is allowed, since the law of August 4th, 1922, makes no distinction between *maximum* and *minimum*. It is forbidden to extend the practice beyond the *maximum*, permitting, for example, the public recitation of the Canon by the people; some Ordinaries used to permit this, to a certain extent, before the decree of August 22nd, 1922.

## II. HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE REV. JOHN M. T. BARTON, D.D., Lic.S.Script.

Readers of *The Times* of November 19th, 1931, will perhaps remember the first announcement of the newly-discovered Chester Beatty papyri by their future editor, Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, late Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum. In the course of a summary in these columns of Kenyon's article, Dr. T. E. Bird expressed the hope that "further information will be forthcoming without delay."<sup>1</sup> Since that time, not only has a beginning been made with the publication of the Chester Beatty papyri in facsimile reproduction, but Sir Frederic Kenyon has explained the importance for textual criticism of these discoveries in the British Academy's Schweich Lectures for 1932. The lectures have now been published under the title *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*,<sup>2</sup> and may be said, as Sir Frederic himself claims they are, to be in some sense a supplement to his earlier works, to which so many students are indebted for their first notions of textual criticism, namely, *The Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (1895, third edition; revised, 1898) and *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (1901, second edition; revised, 1912). "It is hoped," writes the author, "that it may be found useful until the new material has been more thoroughly worked over and digested by specialists, and that it may perhaps encourage some younger scholars to devote themselves to this field of study, in which new recruits are much needed." Certainly, it would be difficult to find a pleasanter or more auspicious manner of embarking upon that "mer insondable," as the subject has been styled by one of our foremost New Testament authorities.

The present book is excellently divided and, as a result, the Chester Beatty manuscripts are seen in their proper setting. The first chapter gives a clear account of Westcott and Hort's work on the New Testament text and its reflection in the Anglican Revised Version. Next, the discoveries of recent years are briefly reviewed—the Sinaitic Syriac, the Washington manuscripts, the Koridethi Gospels, and the rest. The third chapter is concerned with certain developments in textual

<sup>1</sup> CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. III, pp. 416-17.

<sup>2</sup> London: Oxford University Press, 1933. pp. 119. Price 6s.

theory, as exemplified by the publication in the years from 1902 to 1913 of von Soden's edition and by the work that has been done by Streeter, Lake, Blake and others with a view to establishing the existence of a Cæsarean type of text. Chapter IV describes the Chester Beatty papyri, and Chapter V (for many, no doubt, the most interesting because the most personal) sums up and passes judgment upon the work and discoveries of the last fifty years under the heading "Results and Speculations." Finally, in Chapter VI, there is an interesting survey of the work accomplished on the Greek Old Testament since the issue in 1900 of Swete's classic *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. This is a book which is written so clearly and with such scholarly insistence upon the essentials that it can be recommended even to those who are *not* prepared in Streeter's words "to undertake a piece of rather solid reading."<sup>3</sup> Even though few of its readers may feel fired with the desire to become textual critics, they may yet agree that textual criticism "is a fascinating subject in itself, and one in which much good work remains to be done" (page 86).

The Catholic apprentice to textual criticism will find an equally agreeable but somewhat more comprehensive work on the subject in a recent addition to Bloud and Gay's excellent "Bibliothèque catholique des sciences religieuses," the volumes of which have, for the most part, been translated into English as they have appeared and are published by Messrs. Sands and Co. in their "Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge." It is entitled *Initiation à la critique textuelle néotestamentaire*, and its author is M. Léon Vaganay, professor at the Lyons theological faculty<sup>4</sup> and well-known as the author of a scholarly edition of the apocryphal work *L'Évangile de Pierre*, published in the "Études bibliques" series. After a short introduction on the object of textual criticism, M. Vaganay presents his abundant material in five chapters. The first on the "Sources of Textual Criticism" studies, first, the general form, content and appearance of manuscripts and, then, the text of the original Greek and of the more important versions—Latin, Syriac and Coptic. Chapter II on the "Method of Textual Criticism" considers the application of criticism—verbal, external and internal—to the text. There follows in Chapter III a short history of the manuscript text and then in Chapter IV a history of the printed text and a forecast regarding its future control and development. Finally, in Chapter V, there is a brief "Initiation pratique" into critical methods, which is, in great part, a lesson in weighing the probabilities for and against a particular reading. It is hard to see how more could have been compressed, without marked sacrifice of clarity, into so small a number of pages. If one has a complaint against the author of this extremely useful handbook, it is that he seems to be some-

<sup>3</sup> *The Four Gospels*. Third impr. 1927. p. xiii.

<sup>4</sup> Bloud & Gay, 1934. pp. 185. Price 12 frs.



what unappreciative of the great progress that has been made in the course of the last sixty years. No doubt many problems remain unsolved and fresh discoveries may induce a change of opinion in matters of detail, but it is simply untrue to say: "A parler net, la critique textuelle néotestamentaire est à l'état d'ébauche. Qu'il s'agisse des sources, de la méthode, de l'histoire, partout on en est encore à frayer la voie" (p. 6). In such a question the judgment of Sir Frederick Kenyon seems to be preferable. In place of an arbitrary and pessimistic eclecticism, he gives his opinion that "The conclusion, therefore, to which our whole enquiry appears to lead is that for the recovery of the authentic (or the earliest obtainable) text of the New Testament we have to look in the main to the Neutral and Cæsarean texts, with such other sporadic readings as can be shown to be of early date" (p. 86). True, he goes on to admit that we cannot, in the present state of knowledge, "pin our faith on any one manuscript, however high an opinion we may have of its merit." But much of the work done by Westcott and Hort has a lasting and assured value and the discoveries of recent years seem only to emphasize its essential soundness.

Another of the recent numbers in the Bloud and Gay collection is *Les idées juives au temps de Notre-Seigneur*,<sup>5</sup> by Père Joseph Bonsirven, S.J. The author has for many years been a specialist in the Talmudic writings and his work *Sur les ruines du Temple ou Le Judaïsme après Jésus-Christ* has been translated into English with the title *On the Ruins of the Temple*.<sup>6</sup> He now has in the press a two volume study of *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ. Sa théologie*.<sup>7</sup> In the present booklet there is a summary but clear and enlightening account of Jewish theology in Our Lord's time with chapters on God, Angelology, Israel and the surrounding nations, the Tôrâh, Man, Moral principles, Messianism, Eschatology as it affected the individual at death; finally comes general eschatology with sections on the resurrection, the judgment, and eternal reward and punishment. The author realizes that, for a knowledge of Judaism in the time of Christ, a thorough investigation of the Jewish literature is indispensable. One cannot, as he says, rest content with the occasional references in the New Testament or in the frequently unsatisfactory accounts of Jewish doctrines in the works of Josephus. One must take the rabbinical texts and test them by the comparative study of the Old Testament, Josephus, Philo, the apocryphal writings, inscriptions and non-Jewish authorities. For a more ample bibliography and for many of the less important rabbinical texts Père Bonsirven refers his readers to the forthcoming work *Le Judaïsme palestinien*.

An earlier book on Judaism, which has been rendered into

<sup>5</sup> Pp. 220. Price 12 frs.

<sup>6</sup> Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1931. 6s. See CLERGY REVIEW, I, p. 533.

<sup>7</sup> To be published by Beauchesne, Paris.

English under that title,<sup>8</sup> is the work of another very competent authority. It should be observed that M. Vincent's book differs from that of Père Bonsirven in so far as it is a more general sketch of Jewish life, doctrine and customs and is not, like Bonsirven's, confined to the period of Our Lord's coming. It deals with such questions as the rabbinical literature, dogmas in Judaism—in particular with the dogma of monotheism—the special vocation of Israel, Jewish morality, the mystical life in Israel, and private and public worship. The translation by Dr. J. D. Scanlan is perfectly adequate, but it was a mistake to adopt the French form of Hebrew words when recognized English transcriptions exist. Such terms as Rosch-Ha-Chana, Chema, Michnah, Chabtah appear somewhat peculiar owing to the representation of *Shin* by "Ch."

Fr. Urban Holzmeister, S.J., Professor of New Testament Exegesis at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, has written a really useful and thorough work, entitled *Chronologia Vitae Christi*.<sup>9</sup> There is, it is true, already in existence the *Chronologia Veteris et Novi Testamenti in aeram nostram collata*, published in 1924 by Mgr. E. Ruffini,<sup>10</sup> but, although Mgr. Ruffini's book is far more comprehensive, he could only devote forty-six pages to the chronology of Our Lord's life. Fr. Holzmeister, by limiting his field of enquiry to questions of Gospel chronology, has been able to set out very fully all the arguments that are commonly urged in favour of the various systems. As his preface well argues, it is impossible to discuss any one problem regarding the dates of Our Lord's life without bringing in most of the others, since they are so closely inter-connected. The Gospels themselves provide only one strictly chronological text (Luke iii. 1), in which St. Luke tells us that the beginning of John's ministry was in the fifteenth year of Tiberius and, as even a moderate acquaintance with the subject will prove, the exact sense of this indication is itself frequently in dispute. The year of Our Lord's crucifixion cannot be accurately fixed unless two other points have been determined—namely, the meaning of the above-mentioned reference in Luke iii. 1, and the duration of Christ's public ministry.

On these and many other points Fr. Holzmeister provides expert and exceptionally well-documented guidance. His four main divisions are concerned respectively with the chronology of the Nativity, the date of Christ's entrance upon His public ministry, the length of the ministry, and the chronology of the Sacred Passion, but, as might be expected, there are many subsidiary discussions, and the way to a solution can only be found by constant sifting of the somewhat scanty data that are

<sup>8</sup> *Judaism*, by A. Vincent, Professor of the Faculty of Catholic Theology at the University of Strasbourg. Sands & Co., 1934. pp. 261. price 5s.

<sup>9</sup> . . . quam e fontibus digessit et ex ordine proposuit Urbanus Holzmeister, S.J. Romae, sumptibus Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1933. pp. 246. Price not stated.

<sup>10</sup> Casa Editrice Nazionale, Roma.

available. It is possible that on some of these points, Fr. Holzmeister will not convince all his readers—for example, in his arguments for a ministry of three years or his preference for the year 30 as that of the crucifixion. But it must surely be admitted by everybody that he has set out the problems with the utmost fairness and that he has resisted any temptation to overstress the arguments that tell in favour of the hypotheses that he himself adopts. So, at the end of a long discussion regarding the Johannine evidence for a three years' ministry, he concludes: "Quare omnibus perpensis concludendum esse videtur: argumento, quod pro triennio ex dictis tribus textibus Joannis affertur, magna competit auctoritas, at de certitudine ipsius sermo esse non potest" (p. 153). Similarly, as regards the year of the Passion, his final summary, well balanced between the two years 30 and 33, slightly favours the former year. But he adds as his last word on the point: "At tandem, sive annus 30 sive annus 33 fuit ille, quo Christus Dominus cruci affixus est, illud constat eum fuisse annum acceptum, annum gratiae, annum illud, ex quo vere incipit nova haec aera, cujus cardo et caput est Christus crucifixus, qui est Alpha et Omega, Deus benedictus in saecula" (p. 215).

Dom L. Palacios, O.S.B., the Professor of Oriental Languages at Sant' Anselmo, is already known as the author of a well-arranged *Grammatica Syriaca*,<sup>11</sup> which, however, is not yet complete, since the second volume, containing the syntax and a chrestomathy, has still to be printed. Now Dom Palacios has added to his published Aramaic studies a *Grammatica Aramaico-Biblica*,<sup>12</sup> which should be of use to a wider public. Hitherto Catholic students of Biblical Aramaic have been forced to rely upon the German works of Marti, Strack, and Dalman or upon the very compressed information in Professor W. B. Stevenson's *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*.<sup>13</sup> Dom Palacios's *Grammatica* contains all that a student of Old Testament Aramaic should need—an introductory chapter on Phonology; chapters, complete with exercises, on the pronouns, verbs, nouns and particles; a short syntax; a set of paradigms of the verbs; all the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament with sublinear pointing; and a complete vocabulary. It is only to be regretted that, as is so frequently the case with foreign grammars of the Semitic languages, no suitable exercises for translation from English into Aramaic are provided, and that the list of corrigenda is somewhat unduly long.

<sup>11</sup> Desclée, 1931.

<sup>12</sup> Roma, Desclée & Ci, 1933. pp. viii. + 128. Price not stated.

<sup>13</sup> The Society for Old Testament Study announces that a Grammar of Old Testament Aramaic is being prepared by Dr. H. H. Rowley.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### TABERNACLE VEIL.

As there are many different views advanced by writers on the subject could you give the text of the liturgical law as to what is and what is not allowed? (D. H.)

#### REPLY.

The conflict of opinion is due to the fact that many Tabernacles have been permanently constructed in such a way that the full observance of the law is impossible, and in such cases either the law itself is modified or the liturgical authors sanction departures from it, on the principle that no positive law binds *sub gravi incommodo*. If a new Tabernacle is being constructed the rubric should be complied with fully; but if one is already in existence advantage may be taken of the wise toleration of the Church, unless it can easily be altered to comply with the law.

A full compliance with the rubrics requires that the Tabernacle should be completely covered with a veil, and not merely have a curtain hanging before the door. On this there is no possible room for doubt. Canon 1269 directs that it should be "*decenter ornatum ad normam legum liturgicarum*," and these laws are contained in the official liturgical books, supplemented by the directions of the Congregation of Rites. The *Roman Ritual*, Tit. IV, Cap. I, 6, calls this veil "*conopaeum*": "*tabernaculum conopaeo opertum*." The English word "*canopy*" denotes something much larger and is used as a synonym for baldacchino, but *de verbis non est disputandum*. About the thing itself there is no dispute and it is described by De Herdt as "*Conopaeo decenter opertum, id est, velo ad instar tentorii, ex serico lino, cannabe, gossypio aut lana confecto . . .*"<sup>1</sup> a description which agrees with that given by every liturgical writer on the subject. It is a tent-like veil covering the whole Tabernacle.

Nor can it be said that this direction of the Roman Ritual is merely of antiquarian interest and is no longer insisted upon. Several directions of the *Congregation of Rites* order its use: "*Num Tabernaculum, in quo reconditur SSimum Sacramentum Conopaeo cooperiri debeat, ut fert Rituale? Affirmative.*"<sup>2</sup> "*R. D. Archiepiscopus . . . exponens usum ab antiquo tempore vigere non cooperiendi Conopaeo Tabernaculum, in quo asservatur SSimum Eucharistiae Sacramentum, sed intus tantum velo pulchriori serico, saepe etiam argento aut auro intexto ornari;*

<sup>1</sup> *Sacrae Liturgiae Praxis*, I, n. 180, 7.

<sup>2</sup> July 24th, 1855, ad 10, *Decreta Authentica*, 3135.

a S.R.C. humillime petiit: Num talis usus tolerandus sit; vel potius exigendum ut Conopaeum, ultra praedictum velum vel sine eo, apponatur juxta praecriptum in Rituali Romano, S.C. respondendum censuit: Usum veli praedicti tolerari posse; sed Tabernaculum tegendum est Conopaeo. juxta praesciptum Ritualis Romani. Atque ita respondit et servari mandavit."<sup>3</sup> "An Tabernaculum Sanctissimi Sacramenti argento, auro vel alia pretiosa materia confectum, eo ipso a generali obligatione illud tegendi Conopaeo sit immune? Et S.R.C., audita sententia alterius ex Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Magistris, ad relationem Secretarii, sic respondendum censuit: Servetur praesciptum Ritualis Romani."<sup>4</sup> "An servari possit consuetudo non adhibendi conopaeum quo tegi debet tabernaculum, ubi asservatur SSmm Sacramentum Eucharistiae. Resp. Negative, et servetur Rituale Romanum et Decreta."<sup>5</sup>

The liturgical writers, bearing in mind these repeated decisions of the Holy See, unanimously insist on this veil: "A Tabernacle should be free all round so that it may be completely covered by the veil. . . . The veil is a more important and surer sign of the Presence than a Sanctuary lamp. The popular belief that a handsome door dispenses from its use is erroneous, and the substitution of narrow strips of transparent lace is an unworthy subterfuge."<sup>6</sup> "The exterior of the Tabernacle is to be covered with cloth of silk or other fabric, and it is supposed that the Tabernacle stands free on the altar and can be covered entirely with a cover of the shape of the small cover for the ciborium."<sup>7</sup> "Il y aurait faute venielle à violer sciemment et volontairement la rubrique du Rituel qui l'impose."<sup>8</sup> "The form of the canopy is that of a tent, the folds of which are gathered at the top under the cross which surmounts the Tabernacle and then allowed to fall broadly to its base."<sup>9</sup> "The properly constructed Tabernacle should place no obstacle to a full compliance with the rubric, and, we might add, it ought to be the concern of the priest who purchases a new altar to make sure that it is so constructed."<sup>10</sup> Finally, the useful summary of instructions compiled under the direction of Cardinal Vaughan, states: "The conopaeum is a tent-like veil covering the entire tabernacle (front, back, sides and top). . . . Its use is absolutely obligatory on any tabernacle that contains the Blessed Sacrament. It is prescribed directly by the rubrics of the Roman Ritual, indirectly by the Code of Canon Law; and the Congregation of Sacred Rites has decided that neither

<sup>3</sup> April 26th, 1866, n. 3150.

<sup>4</sup> August 7th, 1880, n. 3520.

<sup>5</sup> July 1st, 1904, n. 4137.

<sup>6</sup> Rev. J. P. Redmond in CLERGY REVIEW, III, p. 505.

<sup>7</sup> Woywood, *A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, II, p. 67.

<sup>8</sup> *Ami du Clergé*, 1910, p. 288.

<sup>9</sup> *American Ecclesiastical Review*, XXXI, p. 125.

<sup>10</sup> *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, XIX, p. 543.



custom, nor the presence of an inner veil, nor the fact that the Tabernacle is of precious material or of rich workmanship, dispenses from the observance of the law. Curtains hanging before the door of the Tabernacle are no substitute for the conopaeum and do not fulfil the law."<sup>11</sup>

It is quite certain, therefore, that the *conopaeum* as described is obligatory, and should be employed wherever possible, particularly in the erection of a new Tabernacle. Nevertheless, many altars which have been built in the past, contain a Tabernacle so built into the structure of the altar that the use of a correct *conopaeum* is impossible without destroying the reredos. The beautiful High Altar in the College chapel at St. Edmund's is a good example. The ordinary *odium theologicum* is like the concord of the blessed compared to the dislike which the violent liturgical enthusiast conceives for things which fall short of his rather exacting standard, and he would gladly launch an iconoclastic campaign against such erections, no matter how beautiful and hallowed and ancient they might be. The zeal would be wrong and misplaced, for a positive law does not bind *cum tanto incommodo* and, in any case, it may be dispensed by the competent ecclesiastical authority. For example, in some of the Roman churches the veil is so arranged, for various reasons, that the door is not covered by it. It is wrong to regard an ornamented door as a substitute for the *conopaeum*,<sup>12</sup> but the veil, in these cases, covers the Tabernacle with the exception of the door. Similarly, in this country, curtains hanging before the door often take the place of the *conopaeum*, where its use is impossible because of the construction of the Tabernacle, and the statement in the Directions issued by Cardinal Vaughan that "they are no substitute for the *conopaeum* and do not fulfil the law" seems hardly correct. They are a substitute and they do fulfil the law in so far as it can be reasonably observed. In fact the severity of some writers, already quoted, in insisting on a tabernacle veil can only be understood in the sense that a curtain at least is obligatory.

Closely connected with our subject is the question of using the top of the Tabernacle as a convenient place for the Crucifix or the Exposition Throne. This is a separate problem which we will not discuss here, but it will be evident that the proper observance of the law regarding the use of a *conopaeum* will make it difficult, if not impossible, to use the Tabernacle as a convenience for supporting other pieces of altar furniture, a use which is scarcely consistent with its sacred character.

E. J. M.

#### SUPPORT OF PASTORS.

The following questions were the subject of a discussion here and we would like to have the opinion of the CLERGY REVIEW on

<sup>11</sup> *Directions for the Use of Altar Societies*, p. 12.

<sup>12</sup> S.R.C., Sept. 10th, 1898, n. 4,000, ad. 1.

the matter. They are not, perhaps, very practical, though I have heard that the "shilling per year" system does exist in one diocese :

1. Does the fifth commandment of the Church "To contribute to the support of our pastors" bind the faithful under pain of mortal sin?
2. Could the Ordinary fix a minimum sum of money, to be given by the faithful, *e.g.* one shilling per year,
3. We suppose that a penitent who is able to give a shilling, refuses obstinately to do so. Would the confessor then be justified in refusing absolution?
4. Could the parish priest for the same reason refuse Holy Communion? (H.S.)

#### REPLY.

This question is usually dealt with most superficially by the theologians, chiefly, we suppose, because the custom of requiring the faithful to pay a definite annual sum towards the support of the Church has fallen into disuse. Everyone would agree with St. Thomas that "*ministri Ecclesiae maiorem curam debent habere spiritualium bonorum in populo promovendorum, quam temporalium colligendorum,*"<sup>1</sup> but, in the *corpus* of the same article he teaches that the people are bound to pay tithes (*decimae*) and the obligation arises partly from the natural, partly from the ecclesiastical law. The obligation of the natural law is based on the necessity of the human race worshipping God collectively: the ecclesiastical obligation on the need which may arise for determining more accurately the nature and amount of the offerings to be made for the support of the Christian religion. The Council of Constance condemned the proposition of Wyclif "*Decimae sunt purae eleemosynae, et possunt parochiani propter peccata suorum prelatorum ad libitum summ eas auferre.*"<sup>2</sup> At present the Canon Law is contained in the rather general terms of Canon 1502 "*Ad decimarum et primitiarum solutionem quod attinet, pecularia statuta ac laudabiles consuetudines in unaquaque regione servantur.*"

Ad 1. The obligation is a grave one on the Church at large. Of this there can be no doubt, considering the importance of the purpose for which contributions are levied, and the teaching of St. Paul expressed so forcibly in I Cor. IX, 7-14. While establishing the right, which the Lord ordained, that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel, he himself elected not to claim his right: "Nevertheless, we have not used this power: but we bear all things, lest we should give any hindrance to the gospel of Christ." But it cannot be asserted that the obligation is grave on the part of every individual, because it is one of *legal justice* which cannot easily be determined. The

<sup>1</sup> *Summa Theol.*, II-IIae, q. 87, i, ad 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Denziger*, n. 427.

Church, in a given place, might already be supported adequately by charitable endowments; if not, it is the obligation of the faithful to give according to their means. It is certain that the obligation is much more definite and strict "si ministri non haberent unde sustentarentur,"<sup>3</sup> but even in these circumstances the duty of any individual cannot be ascertained unless the Ordinary of a place has determined exactly the amount to be given by each. We agree with Merkelbach: "Fideles non facile arguendi sunt de gravi peccato, nisi subsidium sine ratione negent atque ita causa sint ut sacerdotes sint in egestate vel ceteri fideles nimis graventur."<sup>4</sup>

Ad 2. It is open to the Ordinary, if the circumstances seem desperate enough to warrant such an action, to fix an amount for individuals. We have no knowledge of the "shilling per year" in any English speaking diocese, but it is quite likely that our correspondent's information is correct. In some French dioceses, after the Law of Separation, the sum of two francs, later increased to ten francs, was fixed for each inhabitant. In certain Spanish-speaking districts it appears that the sum is fixed in proportion to income, e.g., two piastres for an income of 1,000 piastres.<sup>5</sup> Before it can be said, beyond all doubt, that the non-fulfilment of this obligation is a grave sin, it must be established that the Ordinary, beyond all doubt, has imposed it *sub gravi*. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that this has been done: it still remains extremely doubtful whether non-payment involves restitution. The doubt arises, first, from the fact that it is not clearly due on *commutative* justice, and there is common agreement that a violation of commutative justice alone carries with it an obligation to make restitution; it arises, secondly, from the uncertainty of the legislator's intention in this regard. "... quamvis subsidium impositum negantes duplex specie peccatum committant, irreligiositatis atque iniustitiae, Ecclesia tamen non videtur ius suum urgere sub onere restitutionis; unde peccatum videtur potius opponi iustitiae legali quam commutativae."<sup>6</sup>

Ad 3 and 4. A priest is bound to refuse the Sacraments to those who are *certainly* indisposed, i.e., no contrition for grave sin in Penance; the state of mortal sin in Holy Communion (we may pass over the distinction between public and private sinner as irrelevant). From what has been said above, this certainty is lacking, and a priest must be extremely loth to judge the non-fulfilment of this obligation to be mortal sin. Faced with a flagrant example of neglect of this duty, in those places where

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* q. 86, art. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Theol. Moral.*, II, §704; Cf. also *Prummer*, II, §499.

<sup>5</sup> *Ami du Clergé*, 1931, p. 113.

<sup>6</sup> Merkelbach, *loc. cit.* *Prummer, loc. cit.* states that there may be an obligation to make restitution, a conclusion which we think too strict. It is negatived almost immediately "... tamen Ecclesia non videtur ius suum urgere, aut saltem renuntiat restitutioni exigendae ob defraudata vectigalia ecclesiastica."

the Ordinary has settled a fixed amount of contribution, he should first put the case to the Ordinary. ". . . contra mentem Ecclesiae generatim ageret sacerdos, qui non solventibus (subsidiis) sacramenta denegaret aut sacramentalia":<sup>7</sup> "contra mentem ecclesiae" is an extremely mild way of putting it. It seems to us that the scandal resulting from refusing the sacraments for such a reason would be so great that it would never be lawful to do so. "What is my reward then? That preaching the gospel, I may deliver the gospel without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel."<sup>8</sup>

E. J. M.

#### THE LEONINE PRAYERS.

It would be convenient to have a tabulated list of the various occasions on which the usual vernacular prayers, recited at the end of Low Mass, are omitted. (C.)

#### REPLY.

(a) *After a Conventual Mass: Missa Conventualis sine cantu*, that is to say, the Mass celebrated daily in connection with the choral office in those churches where the office is an obligation.<sup>1</sup>

(b) *On Christmas Day* after the first and second Masses, if the three are being said without the priest departing from the altar. It suffices "si dumtaxat peragantur quoties ab altari disceditur, sive discessio post primam Missam, aut post secundam, aut demum post tertiam fiat."<sup>2</sup> Moreover, they are to be omitted even after the last Mass on Christmas Day if it is a sung Mass and follows immediately after the second Mass.<sup>3</sup>

(c) *After a Votive Mass of the Sacred Heart* on the first Friday of the month, when it is celebrated "cum privilegiis Missae votivae solemnibus pro re gravi."<sup>4</sup>

(d) *After Masses celebrated according to the Memoriale Rituum* in small churches. There appears to be no definite ruling of the S.R.C. on this point, but the omission on such occasions as Candlemas Day is consistent with the principle governing all the other authorized exceptions, i.e., the Low Mass is in place of a solemn Mass or it is accompanied by some external solemnity.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Merkelbach, *loc. cit.*

<sup>8</sup> I Cor. IX, 18.

<sup>1</sup> S.R.C. 3697, ad VII. The parochial Mass is not included unless it is immediately preceded by recitation of the Office. (S.R.C. 3858.)

<sup>2</sup> S.R.C. 3705.

<sup>3</sup> S.R.C. 3936, ad I.

<sup>4</sup> S.R.C. 4271, ad 2.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1934, p. 220, quoting *Ephem. Liturg.*, 1929, p. 121; 1931, p. 302.

(e) *When the Mass is immediately followed by some liturgical function*: "Si Missa cum aliqua solemnitate celebretur, vel Missam, quin celebrans ab altari recedat, immediate ac riti subsequatur aliqua sacra functio seu pium exercitium."<sup>6</sup> This rule certainly applies to a Requiem Mass which is followed immediately by the Absolution, but the wording is not decisive and has given rise to many doubts concerning what is "pium exercitium" and "sacra functio." Probably the subject will best be elucidated by enumerating some functions and exercises which are not included.

(i.) The distribution of Holy Communion immediately after Mass.<sup>7</sup>

(ii.) The occurrence of community prayers or meditation or spiritual reading after Mass.<sup>8</sup>

(iii.) The recital of *De Profundis* or other prayers for the dead.<sup>9</sup>

Explanatory of 4305 there is a further decree of the S.R.C., November 25th, 1932, which has not been officially published but has been reprinted in various journals from *Ephem. Liturg.*, 1933, p. 537. After citing the contradictory tenour of some previous decrees two questions were put: I. An decretum diei 20 Junii, n. 4305 interpretationi authenticæ diei 23 Novembris 1887 n. 3682 derogaverit? II. Et quantenus negative, num decretum diei 2 Junii 1916 veluti abrogatum censendum est, an vero vigeat etiamnum tum hoc ultimum, tum præcedens anni 1887? Resp. ad I Negative. Ad II Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam."

Is it possible to define, then, the sacred function or exercise which suffices for the omission of these prayers? A consultor of the S.R.C. gave the following description in *Ephem. Liturg.*, 1933, p. 538, reprinted in *Ami du Clergé*, 1934, p. 221 "decretum 4305 permittit (ut preces omittantur) in fine missæ privatae quæ celebratur occasione extraordinariæ circumstantiæ . . . si immediate post Missam idem sacerdos, quin ab altari in sacristiam redeat, aliquam sacram functionem seu pium exercitium peragat, e.g., sermonem ad populum habeat, vel Benedictionem Eucharisticam impertiatur."

(f) *After a Mass which has been celebrated with some unusual solemnity*. The decree 4305, in addition to the matter just discussed, answers affirmatively to the query "An attentis S.R.C. Decretis n. 3697. Ordinis Min. Capuccinorum, 7 Decembris 1888 ad VII, de Missa Conventuali sine cantu, et n. 4271 Baion. 8 Junii 1911 ad II de Missa votiva lecta SS Cordis Jesu, prima feria cuiusvis mensis, etiam aliqua similis

<sup>6</sup> S.R.C., 4305.

<sup>7</sup> S.R.C. 3682, and S.R.C., June 2nd, 1916, ad III. This portion is not reprinted in *Decreta Authentica*, 4337.

<sup>8</sup> S.R.C., June 2nd, 1916, ad II.

<sup>9</sup> S.R.C. 3805.



Missa lecta, ex. gr. occasione primae communionis generalis, sacrae confirmationis aut pro sponsis, haberi possit ut solemnias, eique applicari valeant praefata decreta quoad preces in fine Missae, a Summo Pontifice praescriptas, omittendas." It is clear that the S.R.C. does not wish to give a list of the occasions of "some solemnity" when these prayers may be omitted. Therefore, in addition to the examples cited in the query, one may rightly include such occasions as the first Mass of a newly ordained priest, or the Mass of a sacerdotal jubilarian.

E. J. M.

#### BAPTISMAL NAMES.

Is it absolutely necessary to take the name of a Christian Saint, i.e., some name found in the Martyrology, or may one choose the name of Adam or of some other patriarch of the Old Testament? (V.)

#### REPLY.

The subject was dealt with, to some extent, in Vol. V, p. 161, of this REVIEW. The terms of the law are such that most of the authors hesitate to say that there exists a certain precept of the Church commanding the name of a Christian Saint to be imposed at Baptism.<sup>1</sup> It is, nevertheless, definitely forbidden to assume the name of some impious person.<sup>2</sup>

With regard to Old Testament names, this rule would exclude such as Jezabel. Many others are permitted because the name happens to be also that of a Christian Saint, e.g., Malachy. But, even though it cannot be discovered that a name in the Old Testament is borne by a Christian Saint, there is certainly no law forbidding it to be assumed in Baptism. "Notat Croix non peccare qui nomen non Sancti imponit; quia imponere Sancti nomen non est praeceptum, sed tantum monitum S. Pii V et Pauli V. Item dicit Croix, contra Basquez, si imponatur nomen Veteris Testamenti, v. gr. Adami, Tobiae, etc. Hoc autem in nostris partibus passim in usu est."<sup>3</sup> The teaching of St. Alphonsus is supported by a modern author "Nomen Christianum est nomen Sancti, vel nomen desumptum e mysterio ad vitam Christi vel B.M. Mariae relationem dicenti (Natalis; Assumpta; Nuntiata) sumi etiam potest e Veteri Testamento."<sup>4</sup>

E. J. M.

#### SCRIPTURE QUERIES.

1. Seeing that Aleph, D, Vet. Ital., etc., omit "He that cometh from Heaven is above all" in John iii. 31, can we read the Baptist as nominative to "seen" in verse 32?

2. Can the words "Lest at any time they should . . .", etc., of Matthew xiii. 15 (Isaias vi. 10) be read as having been spoken

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Canon 761 and *Rit. Rom.*, Tit. II, cap. 1, n. 70.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Génicot, *Casus*, n. 635.

<sup>3</sup> S. Alphonsus, *Theol. Moral.*, VI, 145.

<sup>4</sup> Claeys-Bouaert, *De Sacramentis*, n. 43.

by God in gentle irony, thus: "Be very careful now, or you might be converted!"?

3. What is the Aramaic word for bread?

REPLY.

1. The verses in question (John iii. 31-32) have been translated by Dr. W. S. Reilly in the Westminster Version *St. John*: "He that cometh from above, is above all; he that is from the earth is from the earth, and from the earth he speaketh. He that cometh from heaven *is above all*; he beareth witness of what he hath seen and heard, and his witness no one receiveth." The words italicized are omitted by a number of important manuscripts (Aleph\*, D, Family 1, the old Latin a b e ff<sup>2</sup>, and the Curetonian Syriac) and may well have formed no part of the original text, though, apart from any considerations of internal criticism, the balance of authorities seems to be slightly in favour of their retention. But, as will be readily observed, it is not quite accurate to say that: "He that cometh from heaven is above all" is omitted by the authorities cited; in reality only the three last words are lacking. Hence the phrase, minus the words in question, would read: "He that cometh from heaven, he beareth witness, etc."—words which quite certainly refer to Our Lord and recall His own saying in verse 11 of this chapter: "We speak what we know and bear witness of what we have seen, and ye receive not our witness."<sup>1</sup> The sense of the verses is excellently paraphrased in a footnote by Dr. Reilly: "The heavenly origin of Jesus is opposed to the earthly origin of all others. His knowledge is from heaven, theirs from earth." Whether the words are those of St. John the Baptist or, as a number of exegetes are inclined to think, represent the Evangelist's own reflections, is a matter that does not seriously affect the present issue. The natural sense of the words and the context are wholly in favour of the application of the verses not to the Baptist, but to Our Divine Master.

2. The passage quoted from the book of Isaias occur in the chapter which relates the call of Isaias to his prophetic mission. Jahweh bids him go to the people and announce His judgments upon them. "Go and say to this people, Hear ye indeed but understand not; and see ye indeed but perceive not. Make gross the heart of this people and make their ears dull and close their eyes; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted and healed." To explain these words, it is not necessary to have recourse to any such suggestion as the one made in the enquiry. There is, it may be claimed, no trace of irony in what is evidently a terrible threat of future punishment. The passage has been well interpreted by Père F. Ceuppens, O.P., in his *Isaiae Prophetiarum Collectio prima*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> West. V.

<sup>2</sup> Rome, 1931; see CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. VI, pp. 146-7; Cf. also Père Albert Condamin, S.J.: *Le Livre d'Isaïe*, Paris, 1905, *in loc.*

If the divine judgment is taken with strict literalness then, indeed, it might appear that Isaias's mission was to harden the hearts of the chosen people. But, as various authors have explained, one must take account of two things (1) the Hebrew terminology and (2) the Semitic mentality.

As regards the first point, the Hiphil or causative form of the verb in Hebrew can be used in three senses—causing, permitting, or occasioning. Further, the Hebrew particle *pen* (lest) can be used both finally and consecutively. In the present case, it seems clear that the merely permissive sense of the verbs cannot be invoked; Isaias is carrying out a divine command which must be executed. On the other hand, when we consider the whole history of God's merciful dealings with His people, the purely causative sense appears to be inapplicable. Hence, there appears to be good reason for regarding the prophet's preaching as being simply the *occasion* of the people's hardness of heart; its cause was their own bad dispositions. Secondly, one must reckon with the Semitic type of mind, which tends to leave secondary causes out of account and to refer every form of activity immediately to the First Cause. So Jahweh is said in Exodus vii. 13 and ix. 12 to harden the Pharaoh's heart, because He did not directly frustrate a disposition which was caused by the Pharaoh's own evil state of soul. Further instances of this tendency to neglect secondary causes and to use causatives with various senses are Ps. cix. 10: "Ne repellas me a mandatis tuis!" and the words of the Our Father: "Et ne nos inducas in tentationem," which might be paraphrased for Westerners: "And *permit* us not to be led into temptation."

Since the question has immediate reference to the Isaian passage, I need not here consider the application of the verses in regard of Our Lord's teaching in parables.

3. The word required is *lahmā*. So, in Dr. Burney's attempt at a re-translation of the Greek text of the *Pater*, the fourth petition is rendered:

*Lahman deyōmā*  
Our bread of the day

*hab lan yōmā dēn*  
give to us day this  
J. M. T. B.

## ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

### PRELATES OF THE ROMAN CURIA.

An Apostolic Constitution *Ad incrementum decoris* dated August 15th, 1934, deals with the relative position and privileges of prelates in the Roman Curia. It supplements, and in part supplants, the Motu Proprio *Inter multiplices* issued by Pius X on February 21st, 1905. In twenty-four pages and one hundred and forty-six *numeri* or paragraphs, it establishes the order of precedence and method of nomination, the duties, powers and privileges of each college or quasi-college in the curia, legislating in turn for the Assessors and Secretaries of the Roman Congregations, the Protonotaries, Auditors of the Rota, Clerics of the Camera Apostolica and Prelates of the Segnatura. In all that concerns these officials, references to *Inter multiplices* will have to be checked in future by the new decree.

Outside Italy, interest will centre principally in the few paragraphs which concern Domestic Prelates and the lower grades of Protonotaries. For instance, the regulations for a prelate's robes are re-written, with sundry modifications, in paragraphs seven and nine. Whereas the Motu Proprio did not define the material of the cassock, the Apostolic Constitution declares that it should be "*violacei coloris ex lana vel serico, iuxta anni tempora.*" When the Apostolic See is vacant, the colour should be black, the material wool and the rochet should have no lace. The use of the *habitus pianus*, permitted by the Motu Proprio "*in Congregationibus, conventibus, solemnibus audientiis ecclesiasticis et civilibus,*" is restricted within narrower limits by the new phrase "*in civilibus tantum adhibendus.*"

Since there are several other discrepancies, it may be useful to give the revised text as it stands.

"VII. *Habitus praelaticus, vulgo di formalità, seu in sacris functionibus adhibendus . . . ille est quo utuntur Praelati Domestici quique constat veste talari violacei coloris ex lana vel serico, iuxta anni tempora, cum cauda, nunquam tamen explicanda; reflexus in manicis (paramano), margines vestis nec non mantelleti torulus (filettatura), ocelli et globuli erunt serici et rubini coloris. Zona cum nappis erit serica et violacea; violacea quoque erunt collare et caligae. Calceamenta fibulis erunt ornata. Bireto omnino nigro flocculus imponetur violacei coloris et pileo, item nigro, circumducetur chordula violacea cum flocculo eiusdem coloris. Rocchettum opere phrygio seu reticulato (pizzo) ornabitur, cui si quid supponatur in manicis (trasparente), eiusdem coloris esse debet ac reflexus vestis. Quinam autem sit color violaceus adhibendus, definitur decreto*

S.C. Caeremonialis die 24 Iunii 1933 lato, cui omnino standum est.

"Protonotarii Apostolici utuntur bireto nigro cum flocculo rubini coloris et pileo cum chordula item rubini coloris.

"Vacante Sede Apostolica, vestes erunt laneae et nigrae, cuius coloris erunt quoque collare, caligae, zona cum nappis. Rocchettum erit simplex sine opere phrygio seu reticulato. Flocculus bireti et chordula pilei non mutabuntur.

"IX. Habitus praelaticius, vulgo *piano*, in civilibus tantum adhibendus, constat veste talari nigra sine palliolo (vulgo *pellegrina*), cum torulo, ocellis et globulis rubini coloris; zona cum laciniis (*frange*) erit violacea et item erunt violacea collare, caligae et pallium talare sericum (*ferraiolone*). Calceamenta habebunt fibulas, pileus chordulam violaceam, firmis quae supra constituta sunt de Protonotariis Apostolicis.

"Uti poterunt peramplo pallio talari violaceo (*mantello o tabarro*) absque torulo sed cum subsuto serico violaceo.

"Vacante Sede Apostolica pallium talare erit laneum et nigrum."

Of the later paragraphs, seven are devoted to the three lower orders of Protonotaries: *supranumerarii*, *ad instar* and *titulares* (nn. LIII—LIX). A titular Protonotary, for example a Vicar General, is considered a prelate outside Rome, but is not enrolled in the Pontiff's *Familia* or permitted to wear prelate's robes in the Roman Curia (A.A.S., XXVI, p. 497).

#### THE CAUSE OF PIUS X.

The ordinary informative process concerning the reputation for sanctity of the Servant of God, Pope Pius X, is now completed. The next stage consists in conducting the inquiry, demanded by canons 2038 and 2042, *sequ.*, into writings of whatever kind attributed to the Servant of God.

In the Appendix to a recent number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, the Roman Vicariate issued an appeal to bishops, priests and people to forward the originals or authentic copies of any of his works they may happen to possess, or of which they have knowledge—sermons, letters, diaries, autobiographical notes and so forth, whether printed or written, in his own or in another's hand. The request does not refer to works which are already *publici iuris*, such as pastorals, encyclicals, briefs, apostolic blessings, and so on. Any expense incurred in transcription or postage will be made good, if reported (A.A.S., XXVI, p. 495).



## BOOK REVIEWS

*How to Build a Church.* By Benedict Williamson. (Alexander Ouseley, Limited. 10s. 6d. net.)

We are living in an age of widespread activity in church-building. A more intimate acquaintance with the æsthetic and practical principles of architecture, on the part of the clergy, and with ecclesiastical requirements, on the part of architects, should make for the avoidance of the grievous mistakes which have occurred in the past, and for the building of beautiful churches in the future. Nowadays we are well supplied with architectural books for popular reading, but the only publications devoted exclusively to Catholic interests have come from America. Our thanks are due to Father Williamson for having given us the first book of the kind for English readers. Nevertheless, it must be admitted, sadly, that his work is not wholly satisfactory. The chapters are short, and sometimes scrappy, and seem to have been written in a hurry. His own achievements in church-building are noted for their dignified grandeur and strong originality, and we feel that his book does not do justice to his reputation. He would have done better, perhaps, if he had not bound himself to follow the famous Instructions of St. Charles Borromeo, for, as he is frequently obliged to explain, in many particulars the Instructions have to be modified in view of the changed conditions which have come about in the course of three hundred and fifty years.

On all matters of practical import, such as choice of site, roofing, sacristies, decoration, furnishing, materials, Father Williamson's advice is of the convincing quality that only an expert can give. His opinion, for example, on the use of reinforced concrete is thoroughly well reasoned. He has no sympathy with sentimentalists who deplore the use of what they are pleased to call unnatural material. Concrete is not more unnatural than brick. The objection to the use of concrete and steel, as experience so far has proved, is that in order to make the construction impervious to changes of temperature, highly skilled and costly treatment is required, and the walls have to be made so enormously thick, that in the long run it is more economical to build in stone or brick. Father Williamson sheds a tear over Gothic, and passes it by as one of the dead styles. Many of us think, with Father Rope, that Gothic has returned, and is very much alive. His own enthusiastic preference is for the new style which has appeared in Italy. If the box-like building which has been erected in Rome (cf. Plate III) is representative of what he hails as "the coming style," then we may fervently hope that it may not come beyond the Alps. The new style may have its practical advantages; but to place such a building in an old English town, in challenging contrast with venerable survivors of great Catholic architecture, would be an outrage to good taste and a gesture of vulgarity. On the other hand, Father Williamson's own designs, a feature of the book, are interesting and beautiful, and seem to us to have very little

in common with the coming style. We recommend the book to the clergy; it contains an abundance of useful information, and they will find it interesting even when they disagree.

J. P. R.

*Golden Years on the Paraguay.* By the Rev. George O'Neill, S.J. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. xii. and 276. 5s.)

There is one achievement of the crowded history of the Society of Jesus before which even the toughest anti-Jesuit is silent in tacit veneration—the work of the fathers in the Indian reservations of Paraguay. It is curious that hitherto it has been so difficult to come by a Catholic account of the matter. There is an excellent and well-documented study locked away in *The Catholic Encyclopædia*, but Fr. O'Neill's book is one that the general reader has hitherto sought in vain. It tells, in very readable fashion, and soberly enough the story of how the reservation came to be established in the seventeenth century as a kind of natural sequence to the Jesuit opposition to the oppression of the natives in the sixteenth. Long forgotten heroes are recalled to take something of the honoured place in history that is their due. The long and bitter opposition to the Society's work is dispassionately set down and equally dispassionately the details of the ruin that fell upon the product of two centuries of heroic self-sacrifice when, in 1767, the supine comfortable Catholicism of the eighteenth century, unchastised as yet by the French Revolution, worked the suppression of the great order. Fr. O'Neill has done his work well. It will hold enthralled all who read it, and they will be many.

*Turning to God.* By Rev. Edward M. Betowski. (New York. P. J. Kenedy & Sons. \$2.00.)

It is no easy matter to compose books of sermon notes. If the matter is too detailed the preacher is tempted to take the sermon *en bloc*, to preach what he has not made his own and to be as a consequence unreal and unconvincing. If on the other hand it is over condensed, it may be of no real help; the attempt to be brief may result in notes trite, dull or ineffectual. This sermon book strikes the happy mean. A preacher cannot make a discourse just out of the notes as they stand; but he will find them fruitful of ideas which he can develop after his own fashion. The book is interleaved to give him scope and stimulus for his own initiative. The notes supply material for a year's discourses. The writer's own thoughts on the Epistle, Gospel or Liturgy are supported by references to recent Papal Encyclicals, to Cardinal Gasparri's Catholic Catechism, and to the writings of the saints and religious authors. A single purpose controls them all. It is an excellent idea to concentrate effort on one theme in this way. But it may nullify itself if continued for too long a time; and it is highly disputable if any preacher, however skilled, can retain originality for a whole year, even on a subject so many-sided as conversion.

J. C.

*The Servant of the Sacred Heart.* Selections from the Sermons and Meditations of the Blessed Claude de la Colombière, S.J. Translated and edited by George O'Neill, S.J. (Sands. pp. xiii., 183. 3s. 6d.)

This book should prove useful to a priest in the composition of his sermons. It is full of wise, practical and interesting ideas. Even in the English version you can discern the eloquence of one who was a foremost orator in an age of orators. The themes are various—the right use of time, Hell, the two Kingdoms, the vanity of the world, obedience, patience; but the commonest theme is the love of God, of Christ and of man. The translator has tried to avoid any extracts from his original which show the Jansenistic tinge that infected, at least slightly, all the French leaders of that time. Two matters in the book need a corrective footnote. On page 14, replying to the objection that a momentary sin does not deserve an eternity of punishment, Father de la Colombière introduces the element of persistence in sin, which is not *ad rem*, and imagines the sinner as desirous of living for ever in order to go on defying God for ever. On page 87, he describes transubstantiation as annihilation, creation and the endowing of human flesh with the qualities of spiritual being. J. C.

The enterprise which has characterized the firm of Sheed and Ward from the beginning and which has rendered great service to the English-speaking Catholic world is more than ever conspicuous in their cheap editions of comparatively new books. Mr. Christopher Dawson's *Progress and Religion* can be obtained for 3s. 6d. and his *Age of the Gods* for 8s. 6d. Fr. Przywara's magnificent *Newman Synthesis* costs only 5s., and Cardinal Gasparri's *Catechism* 4s. 6d. *The Life of the Church, The English Way* and *Tudor Sunset* cost 3s. 6d. each, while Dr. Montessori's *Mass Explained to Children* is re-issued for 2s., and Mr. Sheed's valuable *Map of Life* can be obtained for 1s. 6d. Jacques Chevalier's fine large *Pascal* costs 6s. But perhaps the most stupendous value of all is Fr. de la Taille's fascinating volume, *The Mystery of Faith and Human Opinion*, for 6s. We are happy to congratulate Messrs. Sheed and Ward on this continuance of their youthful energy and to bring to the notice of our readers such a valuable collection of important and cheap books.

# THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

## I. ROME.

BY THE REV. RICHARD L. SMITH, Ph.D., M.A.

Rome is back from holiday headed by the Pope, who has enjoyed himself thoroughly at Castelgandolfo despite some newspaper canards. His Holiness made little difference in his ordinary routine: the morning was occupied with audiences and he spent hours with his secretaries, just as if he were still at the Vatican. He did not even go out in the gardens every afternoon—sometimes, indeed, only twice a week—but the air and the quiet cool of the evenings did him obvious good. There proved to be little or none of the inconvenience which was prophesied. People even seemed to like going out into the hills for audience and the Holy Father has pronounced the rooms at Castelgandolfo, though smaller, better arranged for this purpose than those in the Vatican. So it is not rash to suppose that this migration of the Papal Court will now be an annual affair.

There is usually extensive activity in the city before the anniversary of the March on Rome at the end of October. This year it is not quite so much in evidence, though what is being done is feverish enough. The tightness of money has dictated a reduction in the programme, but work on the Viale di Valle Murcia along the slopes of the Aventine is going on day and night. Transplanting the cypresses from the old Jewish cemetery has proved a delicate business and at the moment they stand on the horizon covered in neat sacking, for all the world like trees out of a Noah's ark. Drawings are on view in the Palazzo di Giustizia for the proposed Fascist headquarters, the Palazzo di Littorio, which is to be built on the Via del Impero where the Via Cavour breaks off. The original idea was to build it in two sections on either side of this street and connect the wings with a bridge which should allow traffic to pass and yet hide the incongruous architecture of the Cavour from anyone looking down the Impero. All the drawings do not follow this scheme and they are mostly very modern in style—cubist to quote a barber's description—so that one may take leave to doubt whether they will harmonize with their classical surroundings any better than the flamboyant architecture of forty or fifty years ago. It will be very interesting to see which design is adopted.

There are many other plans on hand which the economic situation is delaying. One of interest to all who know their Renaissance Rome provides for three arterial roads to be driven from the Corso Vittorio Emmanuele to the Ponte Sisto, the Ponte Mazzini and to a new stone bridge replacing the present unworthy Ponte di Ferro, the toll bridge which Romans cross in their hundreds at the cost of a soldo rather than walk five minutes either way to the next bridge. When these roads have been built, the old Rione della Regola is to be "systematized" and we are all waiting to see what this will involve. Across the Tiber the famous prison, Regina Caeli, is to be removed

and the Ponte Mazzini, one of the best bridges built since the fall of the Temporal Power, is to abut on to a gigantic piazza whence avenues will stretch fan-like up the slopes of the Janiculum to the Corsini Gardens on top. These are brave dreams and may there soon be money to pay for them!

One is tempted to delay over such topics, for the rest of the world presents a less pleasant picture. We have had crisis after crisis in political affairs since the Treaty of Versailles, and yet war has always been staved off by a labouring diplomacy. But it was not diplomacy which prevented war after the assassination of Dollfuss; it was Mussolini's prompt show of force on the Brenner. While force is on the side of peace we may breathe comparatively calmly. But the present mentality of Germany is a real and growing menace. In the common opinion she is preparing for war, and it is hard to see in her rulers' idea of right anything beyond the concept of the right of conquest. Even if this suspicion be undeserved no one can trust Hitler's pronouncements; they are made simply to suit the occasion. Hence the extreme caution with which Rome is pursuing the negotiations over the interpretation of the Concordat. There is little doubt here that the official Nazi mind dreams of a German national Church which will be unrecognizable as Christian. Fortunately Catholics and Protestants are both on their guard against this danger and the Nazis are not so constant that we need despair of their changing their minds, especially since it seems probable that they will lean more and more on the old forces of conservatism. But this does not lessen the danger of war, rather it increases it.

Mussolini himself is growing more and more bellicose in every speech he makes, partly as an offset to Germany. He seems persuaded that there will yet be a fight over the independence of Austria and that Italy will have to bear the brunt of it. The vile murder of King Alexander is therefore all the more serious. He was working hard for better relations with Italy, and the Fascists have shown that they desire no slowing up in the momentum of this peace movement by the courteous and surprisingly generous tributes paid in their Press to the memory of the assassinated sovereign. When one remembers the polemics of a few years ago, this is a welcome change. German aggression may so far be a blessing in disguise. The same applies to Franco-Italian relations which are better than they have ever been since the end of the War, but French Republicanism is veritably in the melting pot. The police failure at Marseilles, however excusable it may be, has revived the attacks on the Sûreté Generale which began with the Stavisky scandal, and these attacks have already succeeded in shaking M. Doumergue's cabinet. Everyone prays for the defeat of Freemasonry in France, but the position in Europe is too delicate at the moment to allow the risk of a French Revolution.

Something similar must be said about Spain. The Socialists will not allow the Church fair play and it looks as if Spain



will have to face a real civil war before these revolutionaries learn the first lessons of democracy. But it is a terrible price to pay, a remedy as dangerous as the disease. In Latin America the Eucharistic Congress forms a bright spot and the Pope's creation of fourteen sees in Argentina holds out great hopes for the progress of the Faith in that Republic. Turning north, Roosevelt is far from out of the wood, though it is an open secret that the Vatican views his efforts with the most benevolent interest. Rumour has it, whatever foundation it may possess, that he gave his cabinet the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* to read; certainly he began his administration by quoting St. Paul's eulogy on charity. There is Christianity behind many Governmental moves in the United States to-day.

With Russia in the League of Nations, that body has definitely proclaimed its indifference to Christian principles. At present we are all at peace for utilitarian reasons; but once any country becomes persuaded that the gamble of war is worth while, it is difficult to see how war can be averted. The *Osservatore Romano* faithfully chronicles England's progress along the path to economic recovery. But the tragic paradox stares one in the face that England's comparative disarmament had reduced her influence in the counsels of Europe. A weary world indeed: and no one knows it better than the Pope who is the guardian of Christian principle.

## II. CENTRAL EUROPE.

BY C. F. MELVILLE.

### 1. Germany.

The religious situation in Germany is still in a very critical phase. A great deal of alarm has been caused by the campaign of the "German Christians" for a National German Church, to include both Catholics and Protestants, a campaign which, in spite of official governmental denials, is known to have the sympathy of Reich-Bishop Mueller, the Nazi Primate.

Actually the efforts of the "German Christians" have resulted in throwing the Catholics and Protestants together in their determination to resist the attempts of the Nazis to submit religion in Germany to the process of *gleichschaltung*. The opposition of the Protestant pastors to Reich-Bishop Mueller continues to grow. At the same time the Catholics continue to fight for the preservation of their rights, agreed to under the Concordat, to maintain Catholic institutions and Youth movements.

The Concordat is still, to all intents and purposes, a dead letter. The negotiations which it had been hoped would clear up the differences in interpretation between the Nazis and the Catholic Bishops were broken off without any definite conclusion having been reached.

The essential fight is between authentic Christian principles and the quasi-pagan ideas of many of the Nazi leaders. This fight is now at its height and none can say at the moment how

it will turn out. His Holiness the Pope has exhorted the German Catholics once again to be calm and steadfast.

## 2. Austria.

Catholic circles in Austria are now criticizing Nazism from a new angle. Their point of view is that Nazism has broken the cultural and ideological ties which used to unite all Germans living outside the boundaries of the Reich.

In this connection the Catholic *Reichpost* of Vienna writes that untold damage has been done to the cause of *Auslandsdeutschtum* (Germans living in foreign countries) by the fact that the Nazis have tried to change the cultural claims of the German people into State political aspirations. The Third Reich, says this paper, has thus thrust the German minorities in other countries into difficulties with the majority populations. To the majority, it complains, Herr Hitler has given the weapon of totalitarianism. By this is meant the following: that since in the Third Reich the predominance of the "national" majority is insisted upon, in other countries where there is a non-German majority the authorities have only to take a leaf out of the Nazi book and favour their own national majority to the prejudice of the German minority.

Catholic circles in Austria also complain that Herr Hitler has disrupted *Auslandsdeutschtum* by introducing a brutal political battle into Germanism, and has by these means created an "inner German conflict."

Bishops in frontier provinces are rallying round the *Oesterreichische Verband für Volksdeutsche Auslandsarbeit*; and two great Austrian Catholics have made declarations regarding the Christian mission of Austria for the German peoples abroad. Pater Hugo Hantsch claimed for the new Austrian State idea that it was as old as the Ostmark, containing a basic national element which must be developed; while Dr. Czermak, a former Minister, declared that: "We Austrians have to serve the ideal of the 'Volk' national idea and the cultural union of all Deutschtum." He added that the Austrian people, who for thousands of years had kept faith in Deutschtum, want now to keep faith both to their own State and to the whole German people.

These ideas throw a good deal of light upon the ideas influencing the present régime in Austria. They make it easily understandable that when the local Nazis sought a basis for co-operation with the *Vaterlandische Front*, the spokesmen on the Government side made it clear that in any negotiations which might be entertained the idea of Austria as a Christian Corporative State must not be called in question in any way.

It does not seem that these *pourparlers* between the Government and the Nazis have made much progress. The sort of terms which might satisfy Chancellor Schuschnigg would not satisfy Herr Hitler, and, conversely, the sort of terms which would satisfy Herr Hitler would not be acceptable to Herr Schuschnigg.

## REVIEW OF REVIEWS

The September number of *STUDIES* opens with an article on "Ireland and the Reform of Democracy" in which Professor Michael Tierney has many sharp and true things to say regarding popular fallacies about the democratic principle. It is in some sense a review of M. Lavergne's *Le Gouvernement des Démocraties Modernes* with special applications to Ireland. In his judgment Lavergne's book, though by no means free from faults, in particular the vice of over-simplification, has two great merits: "It provides a reasonable theoretical foundation for the doctrine of universal suffrage, and it insists at the same time on the inadequacy of the traditional belief that the wisdom of the community can be best found by counting heads" (p. 380). As regards Ireland, in Dr. Tierney's opinion: "The sovereignty of Parliament must be modified and with it must go our own peculiar version of the Totalitarian State" (p. 382). Fr. Thurston, S.J., in "Saint Ignatius at Montmartre: August 1534—August 1934" celebrates the fourth centenary of the Society's foundation. In some comments on Père Dudon's recent *Saint Ignace de Loyola*, he comments favourably upon the change in hagiographical methods that has taken place within the last century. With Père Dudon he rejects the exaggerated stories current among certain earlier biographers regarding St. Ignatius's extraordinary austerities at Manresa, the "direct co-operation from on high" given for the composition of the Exercises, and the "idea that an exact conception of the future Society was revealed to the Founder even before he made his pilgrimage to the Holy Land" (p. 390). Mrs. Virginia Crawford has an excellent short discussion of "Social Work in Holland"; it will be news to many people that Holland can boast no less than thirty Catholic daily papers and that the Hilversum broadcasting station is Catholic-owned and was erected out of the subscriptions of 160,000 Dutch Catholics. In conclusion, Mrs. Crawford emphasizes the immense good that is being done by the Ladies of the Grail and the Congregation of St. Reinilda. In "The Other Hidden Ireland," Mr. Aodh de Blacam points to the widespread use of Gaelic, in former times, among Irish Protestants.

In the October BLACKFRIARS, Fr. H. Muñoz, O.P., provides what is in effect a reasoned answer to a wild article in the current *NEW STATESMAN AND NATION* (Oct. 13th, 1934) on the need of rescuing Spain "from the paralyzing grip of the Catholic Church." As Fr. Muñoz shows: "Whatever *New State* the Right may come to form, the first principle of their programme is the defence of the Catholic Church, because she is the animating principle of the history of Spain and of Spanish tradition" (p. 659). Fr. Ferdinand Valentine in "Film and Catholic

Action" comments scathingly upon the wilful misrepresentation of history and Catholic life in certain recent films—in particular *Man of Aran* which attempts to portray the Isle of Aran and yet manages to leave out all mention of the influence of the Catholic Church," and *Queen Christina* which pretends that a vulgar intrigue, and not her conversion to the Church, was the reason for the Queen's act in relinquishing the Swedish throne. He pleads for a greater knowledge of film-technique among the public, which will make for a contempt of film propaganda, so that it may no longer be true, in a phrase of Lucien Romier that: "Jamais public ne se livra plus docilement que le public de cinéma."

The MONTH for October prints an article by Mgr Newsome on "The Problem Boy—and his Problem Parents," which provides expert advice for parents of backward or defective children regarding the latter's chances of earning a living. Farming, which by some well-meaning but ignorant people is regarded as a heaven-sent employment for defectives, is, in reality, not a simple occupation "like serving in a shop, working in a bank or attending a machine. It includes a great range of different jobs, each of which calls for expert knowledge and skilled work." In "Spiritualism for the Masses," Fr. Thurston, S.J., discusses the dangers to health and sanity that are present in spiritualistic practices, and the almost incredible credulity of "the rank and file of the Spiritualist battalions." The article is a sort of supplement to the author's "The Church and Spiritualism" and contains a reply to certain criticisms by Dr. M. H. Browne of Maynooth. In "The Catholic Worker" Mr. N. McKenna describes the astonishing success of a paper of that name in the United States. In the "Miscellanea," those interested in the British Israelite movement will find a short summary of its violently anti-Catholic activities; and those enthusiasts who are not weary of finding just one more historical blunder in Macaulay will especially enjoy Mr. J. G. Muddiman's notes on "Dom John Hudleston, O.S.B.: Some further corrections of Macaulay."

That lively quarterly COLOSSEUM, which has as its sub-title "The Quarterly of Action—Not a Polite Review," prints in its third (September) number an article on Mr. Shaw by Laurence Oliver, which proves that its rejection of the function of a merely "polite review" is no vain boast. In "A Bow to Mr. Shaw" there is some very hard hitting, but it is all well-deserved for, as Mr. Oliver claims: "Mr. Shaw's opinions are no less than the farcical remarks which he puts into the mouths of his most farcical characters." The analysis of Shaw's political and religious aberrations is masterly, a vigorous offensive in place of a timid and apologetic defence. In "The Real Issue" Mr. Christopher Dawson with his usual blend of learning and lucidity outlines the conflict between Catholicism and Communism, though, as he points out, the conflict is really not a straight fight but a three-cornered one since Capitalism is also

one of the combatants. "Not only Socialists, but social reformers of all kinds, including Catholics, are only too apt to treat Capitalism as a kind of abstract bogey which is responsible for all our ills, and not to remember that Capitalism is nothing else but *economic liberalism*, and that it has a very close relationship not only with political Liberalism, but also with liberal philosophy or philosophic idealism" (p. 18). Even granting that Communism in the orthodox sense is not likely to come in Western Europe and that the European society of the future will find a place for the bourgeois and perhaps even for the Capitalist "from the religious point of view it will be much the same thing in the end, for it will find no place for the Christian or for the human soul" (p. 23). The answer to secularist propaganda lies in the apostolate of the laity. There are useful sections on the Cinema, the Theatre and Music. Altogether an excellent number, which should gain many new subscribers to this courageous venture.

NOVA ET VETERA "Revue catholique pour la Suisse Romande" has an article of interest to English readers on "L'Âme religieuse de Ruskin" by Père C. Saarda, S.J., in which the conclusion is reached that Ruskin accepted many of the Church's dogmas, not because he recognized her authority but because they pleased him. Various circumstances—his Protestant upbringing, his belief in the principle of private judgment, and his health which did not permit him to make exhaustive enquiries—seem to have kept him from the Faith in its entirety. "... Il n'a pas, croyons-nous, péché contre la lumière. ... Mais le ferme critérium de la vérité religieuse lui a manqué."

The RIVISTA DEL CLERO ITALIANO continues its policy of devoting each number to some special aspect of Catholic life or devotion. The present (October) number has a number of excellent articles on methods of religious instruction. With this one may associate the August number, which was wholly concerned with the best manner of meeting the Protestant propaganda in Italy.

The Belgian review LA CITE CHRETIENNE has changed its outward form (it is now less like a review and more like a newspaper), but its contents are as varied and useful as ever. The number for October 5th has a good article on the Redemption by Père G. Dirks, S.J.

J. M. T. B.



ocial  
apt  
a is  
lism  
very  
also  
Even  
kely  
of  
even  
will  
lace  
wer  
ity.  
usic.  
new

le ”  
ame  
the  
ch’s  
use  
up-  
and  
tive  
ety.  
é.”  
ring  
ion.  
cles  
iate  
best

its  
e a  
ver.  
ion  
3.